

Indonesia Labor Shows Power in Strike Struggles

JAKARTA, Indonesia, Nov. 1950 — The Indonesian revolution, which entered a new phase with the granting of a federation status to the "United States of Indonesia" in 1949, has in the recent period brought the masses into sharp conflict with the native capitalists. A new wave of economic and political struggles has resulted. The clearest expression of the desires and moods, the dissatisfaction and anger of the Indonesian masses has been given by Partai Murba (Proletarian Party), the party of the extreme left inspired by the great leader of the Indonesian working class, Tan Malakka. (Tan Malakka has periodically been reported as dead in the capitalist press of Holland and of the U.S.; but he is known to be alive.)

A mighty strike of 700,000 plantation workers on the island of Java was led to victory by the trade union Sarbopri on Sept. 18, when, after weeks of struggle, the workers got a wage increase of 100%.

There is also a growing mass movement whose goal is the expulsion of foreign capital from Indonesia. The rights of this capital have been guaranteed by the "Round Table" decisions at The Hague where Indonesia was granted her independence within the framework of the Dutch Commonwealth.

The secretary of the trade union federation, the SOBSI, in the

big port of Surabaya made the following statement on Sept. 20: "During the days of the revolution the workers took into their hands the management of the enterprises and the factories in the name of the Republic of Indonesia. The Round Table Conference, with a single stroke, wiped away this conquest. That this was possible shows that our revolution has been stranded."

The Indonesian workers are clearly taking into account the class contradictions within the Indonesian Republic. During the strike of the plantation workers, a boycott was carried on against the Jakarta daily, Pedoman, which had slandered the strikers. The printers and employees of the printing plant refused to do any work on this paper which had to suspend publication. Meanwhile, neighborhood committees at Surabaya adopted, at a joint meeting, a number of sharply-worded resolutions. Among the demands was the abrogation of higher rates on gas and electricity, otherwise the working population would refuse to pay its bills.

ULTIMATUM ISSUED
Another demand was that the distribution of necessities be

(Continued on page 3)

NAZI GENERALS WILL HEAD NEW WEHRMACHT

By Joseph Keller

Western imperialism's moves to reestablish a German army under the command of former Nazi generals is one of history's supreme ironies. It was at Yalta less than six years ago, near the close of the war that cost 60 million lives, that Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin solemnly vowed "our inflexible purpose to destroy German militarism."

Now, reestablishment of German military power — this time as an ally of "democratic" imperialism — is regarded by the capitalist powers, especially the United States, as indispensable to their plans for war against the Soviet Union. Hitler, it seems, may have the last laugh after all.

NEW WEHRMACHT PLANNED

Since the Brussels conference of the 12 Atlantic Pact governments two weeks ago, there has been less and less pretense that German rearmament, at least as envisioned by Washington and Bonn, is to be limited and strictly controlled. What is planned is a new Wehrmacht run by the old Nazi officers' corps.

After the first meeting between the Allied High Commissioners and Chancellor Adenauer to negotiate the terms of German rearmament, it was announced that the Allies are prepared to make sweeping concessions to the Bonn government of former Nazi cartels and militarists. The Allies are in the grotesque position of having to offer terms to the conquered to induce the latter's "cooperation" in rearming to defend the conquerors.

MAKE A DEAL

On Dec. 21 the Allied High Commissioners reached agreement with Adenauer to put their relations "on a contractual basis," which, said the Associated Press, "implied a sweeping away of occupation controls in exchange for German participation in a

German Unionists Oppose Scheme For Rearmament

Reflecting the overwhelming opposition of the German workers to remilitarization as planned by the Western powers and the Bonn capitalist government, the Executive Committee of the German Federation of Trade Unions in Western Germany attacked the rearmament scheme, declaring:

"Who can earnestly believe that the workers are ready to defend the interests of the privileged classes? Who is going to protect a state that refuses its workers equal rights in the economy of the country? ...

"Maybe they can find mercenaries who, for money, decorations, and the false splendor of rank, are prepared to fight here instead of in some other part of the world. BUT THOSE WHO REALLY MATTER — THE GREAT MASS OF WORKING PEOPLE — WILL FIGHT ONLY FOR A CAUSE THAT IS THEIR OWN."

Bring the Troops Back Now

An Editorial P. 3

Hoover's Speech Shows Rulers Split on Tactics

By John G. Wright P. 3

Asia's Monroe Doctrine

By George Lavan P. 4

New Gestapo Powers Voted For the FBI

The power of the FBI to function as an American Gestapo would be strongly increased under the provisions of a new bill sent Dec. 21 by Congress to the White House for signature.

The bill would empower the FBI to arrest anyone without warrant if a G-man has "reasonable grounds" to "believe" a felony has been committed. This loosely formulated bill would make it possible for the FBI to arrest any person on suspicion.

Such a law would be a clear violation of the Bill of Rights, which states: "The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the person or things to be seized."

This bill follows closely upon the recent decision of a federal Court of Appeals in the Judith Coplon case, in which her conviction was reversed because she had been arrested by the FBI without a warrant.

In this case, the Court questioned the Constitutionality of such an arrest, in which the FBI did not even have proof to show that there was "danger of the suspect escaping" as required in the old law.

NO ONE SAFE

Although the old law broadly interpreted would allow the FBI to swoop down upon helpless citizens and place them under arrest on the pretext that they might escape, the new bill broadens the FBI power more easily to violate the civil rights of individuals.

The bill would give FBI men the right to arrest workers they "suspect" or "believe" are involved in espionage, sabotage or other major crimes. Thus, a worker who engaged in militant union action in a plant could be arrested without a warrant on the grounds that an FBI agent thought he was "sabotaging" war production.

This bill is part of the process of transforming the U.S. into a police state. The FBI has not hesitated in the past to invade the sanctity of the home, spy on the personal lives of many individuals, arrest and hold "suspects" without warrant. But now, these violations of civil rights are to be legalized.

Workers of the World, Unite!

THE MILITANT

PUBLISHED WEEKLY IN THE INTERESTS OF THE WORKING PEOPLE

Vol. XV - No. 1

NEW YORK, N. Y., MONDAY, JANUARY 1, 1951

PRICE: FIVE CENTS

White House Launches Drive for Wage Freeze

Tightening the Belt



Truman-Acheson Block Negotiations With Mao

After almost four weeks of futile negotiations, primarily by the Indian and Arabian delegations at the UN, the Peiping plenipotentiaries departed from Lake Success. The head of the Chinese delegation Wu Hsiu-chuan placed the blame for this failure to reach a peaceful settlement of the Far East crisis upon the American imperialists. And that is exactly where it belongs.

The Truman administration refused to negotiate with China except on its own terms. The British press has carried significant revelations on this score. The influential Manchester Guardian, for example, disclosed that the main bar to negotiations from the outset was the "unwillingness" of American diplomats to meet with the Chinese. Leading this pack who refuse to treat Peiping as an equal is Secretary of State Acheson.

It was he, in particular, who "would not consider inclusion of Formosa in any negotiations with the Chinese Communists," reported the Manchester Guardian.

China's Views
Apart from other considerations, the Chinese could not view this refusal even to discuss issues with them, otherwise than as an insult, especially an issue so vital to their country as Formosa.

They took it, as it was intended, for a refusal to accord them the treatment of an equal.

Wu Hsiu-chuan had made it plain that his government would tolerate no treatment as a puppet or an inferior, would not be ordered around, and could not be cowed by bluster or threats. This was made so plain that one surprised UN delegate remarked that Peiping's representatives do "not speak at all like the Chinese whom we have learned to love and respect." Emphatically, no.

The representatives of revolutionary China not only speak differently but act differently from the corrupt and servile colonial flunkies to whom the imperialists have grown so accustomed and whom they love to treat condescendingly, with a tinge of contempt.

Apparently it will take more than the disaster already suffered in Korea before the snobbish bandits of imperialism learn to accept the new world power which is China. Washington, prodded by Gen. MacArthur, keeps toying with the notion of a "limited war" against Peiping. According to an Associated Press dispatch, Dec. 26, the U.S. intends to press next week in the UN for "a world economic boycott" as a possible "next step" against the Mao regime.

Meanwhile, a blistering radio speech was made in Norway by Trygve Lie, UN General Secretary, falsely blaming China for any war that might result from the Korean adventure, of which Lie was one of the prominent promoters. Thus, the setting is being prepared for another attempt to have the UN brand China as "an aggressor." This, too, is now "under study" in Washington. Truman-Acheson are working to provide Gen. MacArthur with the UN cover he needs to conduct the "new war" he personally proclaimed when his armies were routed at the Manchurian border.

Ironically enough, the same people who persist in treating China as a colonial dependency are giving world publicity to a rumored rift between Peiping and Moscow. Last week, within the space of 48 hours, the N. Y. Times front-page two cables, one from Tokyo and the other from Belgrade. The gist of both reports is that China was challenging not alone in Korea but also throughout Asia, the Kremlin's pretensions to dominate. While this is still in the realm of reports, the reality is that the domination of U.S. imperialism in Asia has been challenged, and this in dead seriousness by China. (The reported China-Moscow rift will be fully treated in our next issue — Ed.)

Auto Ruling Sets Precedent For Curb on All Pay Boosts

By Art Preis

Truman has followed his "national emergency" decree for austerity and a garrison state with the first major move toward a wage freeze. This is the temporary directive by Economic Stabilizer Alan Valentine, effective until March 1, to bar any improvements in auto wage contracts.

Since the CIO auto workers are not pressing for contractual changes now and since these con-

tracts by their own terms are fixed for five years, the order will have no practical effect on the auto workers' immediate wages.

But the order does have great significance as a precedent that will have tremendous effect on the wages of all labor in the long run. It is an assertion by the government of the wage-freezing principle — the first step in the enforcement of the wage "stabilization" clause in the Defense Mobilization Act passed by the last Congress and signed by Truman.

A PRECEDENT

Through Valentine's auto order, the administration has exercised the power to freeze wage contracts. What is to prevent that policy from being extended to other — in fact, all — industries? That is clearly the aim of the government which regards the measure taken in the auto industry merely as part of the groundwork for the ultimate establishment of a general wage "stabilization," a misleading word for wage-freezing.

At issue in the case of the auto workers are the escalator clauses they have won in most of their contracts, including those with General Motors, Chrysler and Ford. That issue the Wage Stabilization Board was able to avoid because the next upward automatic adjustment of wages in line with price rises is not due until March 1.

Valentine's order neither approved nor disapproved of the application of the escalator clause, stating that the freezing of the auto contracts was "without implication as to the eventual approval or disapproval" of the escalator clauses. Walter Reuther, (Continued on page 4)

BIG BUSINESS MEN HEAD 'GARRISON STATE' SETUP

The Truman administration which has begun the transformation of the U.S. into a "garrison state" with its proclamation of a "national emergency" is now giving all the posts of command to Big Businessmen.

Simultaneous with the declaration of the "emergency" was the appointment of Charles E. Wilson as Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization. As the N. Y. Times summarized it, Truman "delegated most of his own wartime powers" to Wilson, "whose unparalleled controls over the country's economy will be subject only to Presidential veto."

Wilson was the president of General Electric, one of the greatest monopolistic anti-labor corporations in the country. The new Defense Mobilizer immediately after appointment announced his appointment of General Lucius Clay and S. J. Weinberg as specialists. Clay's qualifications include having been Chairman of the Board of Continental Can Co. and the former Military Governor of U.S.-occupied Germany. Weinberg is senior partner of a Wall Street banking firm.

MONOPOLY PRESIDENT

Other recent appointments include: William H. Harrison, president of International Telephone and Telegraph, a worldwide monopoly, appointed to the post of Administrator of the National Production Authority. This is the main agency for controlling production, allocating scarce materials and requisitioning necessary facilities.

Alan Valentine appointed to the post of Administrator of

Economic Stabilization. He will set wage and price policy. He is a reactionary Republican, a professional denouncer of New Deal concessions to labor as "regimentation."

John D. Small, president of Maxson Food Systems, Inc. and vice-president of Emerson Radio now heads the Munitions Board. Thomas Dudley Cabot, Boston industrialist and banker, appointed chairman of the Committee on International Security Affairs.

Cyrus Ching, professional labor relations man for corporations and government mediator, formerly of U.S. Rubber Co., appointed chairman of the Wage Stabilization Board.

LABOR LEADERS OUT

The labor bureaucrats have been completely frozen out on "emergency" appointments. These loyal lackeys of Truman watch in chagrin as Republicans, anti-Fair Dealers — it matters not what, as long as they are recommended by the monopolists — get the important posts.

The United Labor Committee, representing the AFL, CIO, Railroad Brotherhoods and the Machinists' Union, has made this bitter protest: "We regret that to date labor has not enjoyed opportunity for full participation in the mobilization effort. . . . No one group has a monopoly of ideas in the mobilization of our resources."

Fourth International's Appeal to Yugoslav Communists

Comrades:

In face of the change in the foreign policy of your government since the Korean war, it is no longer possible to hide the uneasiness which has seized the revolutionary forces throughout the world who since its break with the Kremlin have placed their active sympathy, their enthusiasm and their hopes in the Yugoslav revolution.

This uneasiness is now being transformed into the distressing feeling that a real catastrophe is approaching which could wipe out all the progressive influence thus far exerted by the Yugoslav revolution on the international labor movement. It flows from the recent declarations of Yugoslav leaders which are interpreted as dragging Yugoslav foreign policy in the wake of American imperialism and its tool, the United Nations.

Unless there is a prompt and

firm reaction by your party which would correct the course towards a capitulation to the demands of imperialism outlined by your government, proletarian Yugoslavia will lose the sympathies it has won among the international revolutionary vanguard and particularly among the worker and colonial masses following the Communist parties.

MAIN STRENGTH

Up to the Korean war the main strength of your revolution was your independence toward Moscow and Washington and the many times repeated promise of all your leaders not to tie themselves to any bloc and to follow a truly Marxist-Leninist line.

Proletarian Yugoslavia now appears to be abandoning its independent policy and to be aligning itself with the imperialist bloc directed by Washington. Your government does so to the extent

that it now discovers the "constructive" and "peaceful" role of American imperialism, its "disinterested" aid, the relative benefits of the "Marshall Plan," and would be ready to ratify the decisions of the overwhelming capitalist majority of the UN in defining and invoking penalties against the "aggressor" in the person of the colonial peoples of Korea and China struggling for their independence. Such an attitude could only realize the hopes of the Kremlin which has been trying, ever since the first day of your rupture with it, to isolate Yugoslavia in order to make it capitulate to imperialism and thus discredit it in the eyes of the proletarian and colonial masses influenced by the Communist parties.

No doubt your serious internal difficulties and fear of a military attack from the armies of the Kremlin explain the extent of the

concessions your government is now making to the imperialists. Certainly, the blockade to which the Kremlin has subjected Yugoslavia to prevent the success of your experience with a free development of the revolution, as well as the weakness of the aid you have received from the world working class up to the present, have contributed to weaken the resistance of your government in the face of the brutal demands of imperialism. We thoroughly appreciate all this and the necessity to make certain compromises, but we cannot and do not justify such a pronounced trend toward capitulation.

SOLE REAL SUPPORT

We consider on the contrary that the path on which your government is directing the foreign policy of Yugoslavia, far from bringing a solution to the serious internal difficulties of the country

and the menace of military attack from the Kremlin, will have only the effect of weakening Yugoslavia by depriving it of its sole real support — the sympathy and active aid of the world working class and colonial millions.

From the viewpoint of the general and historical interests of the world proletariat, the aim is not to save the power conquered in any given country at no matter what cost or by any and all deformations and concessions. Marx, Rosa Luxemburg, and Lenin taught us that some defeats are worth infinitely more than certain victories; that there are "victories" and adaptations which are in reality crushing defeats.

If Yugoslavia should capitulate before American imperialism, it may benefit from a respite and safeguard for a period the economic and social bases of its workers' regime. But in reality an alignment of its foreign policy

with that of the imperialists would in the long run have inevitable internal repercussions and its proletarian regime would be doomed.

In the interim, its existence would not contribute to the reawakening and regroupment of the revolutionary forces of the proletariat and the colonial masses, but to their prostration before the Soviet bureaucracy and Stalinism.

In order not to capitulate before imperialism and the growing internal difficulties, it is then necessary purely and simply to abdicate from power and conclude that there is no longer any perspective for the workers state and socialism in Yugoslavia?

Not at all!

It is not in our power nor is it our intention to instill defeatism in you. Hold out, maneuver at home and abroad, exploit interna-

(Continued on Page 2)

PROMINENT FIGURES ORGANIZE GROUP TO REPEAL McCARRAN LAW

Formation of a committee of thirty-two prominent Americans to fight for repeal of the McCarran police-state law was announced Dec. 26 by Dean John B. Thompson, of the University of Chicago, and Robert Morss Lovett, spokesman for the group.

"The hysteria and intimidation the law has evoked in the two months since its passage have opened the eyes of many who were not fully aware of the dangers of such repressive legislation," the spokesmen said.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Other initiators of the repeal campaign include Thomas Mann and Emily Greene Balch, Nobel Prize winners; Bishop W. J. Walls of the A.M.E. Zion Church; Frank Rosenblum, secretary-treasurer of the CIO Amalgamated Clothing

Workers of America; Pierre van Passen, author and Unitarian clergyman; Frank Aydelotte, Institute of Advanced Studies and Dr. John A. Mackay, President of Princeton Theological Seminary.

Other initiators of the repeal campaign, who stated that they believe the law to be unconstitutional, were:

Dr. Abraham Cronbach, Hebrew Union College; Prof. A. G. Borghese, University of Chicago; Prof. Zachariah Chafee Jr., Harvard University; Dr. Mark A. Dawber, former executive secretary, Home Missions Council of North America; Mrs. Welthy Honsinger

Fisher, Chairman, World Day of Prayer Committee, the Right Rev. Benjamin D. Dagwell, Protestant Episcopal Bishop of Oregon.

Also Dr. Edwin T. Dahlberg, Delmar Baptist Church, St. Louis; Prof. E. Franklin Frazier, Howard University; the Rev. John Paul Jones, Union Church of Bay Ridge, Brooklyn; Rabbi Leo Jung, Rabbinical Council of America; Bishop Gerald Kennedy, Portland area, the Methodist Church; Methodist Bishop Francis J. McConnell; Carey McWilliams, author; Dr. Alexander Meiklejohn, Berkeley, Calif., former president of the University of Wisconsin; Dr. Albert W. Palmer, moderator of Congregational-Christian Churches of America.

In addition, the Right Rev. Edward L. Parsons, Episcopal Bishop, retired, of San Francisco; Linus Pauling, California Institute of Technology; Prof. Ralph Barton Perry, Harvard; Dr. Edwin McNeill Potest, Pulliam Memorial Chapel, Raleigh, N.C.; Paul Tillich, Union Theological Seminary, New York; Mrs. M. E. Tilly, Southern Regional Council, Atlanta; Charles J. Turk, President, Macalester College; and Oswald Voelken, Institute of Advanced Study, Princeton.

GORDY DEFENSE COMMITTEE GAINS SUPPORT OF NAACP

DETROIT — Despite earlier reluctance of Negro leaders to defend Charles Gordy Sr., on trial for murdering one cop and wounding another, the Detroit NAACP at its annual membership meeting

on Dec. 17 overwhelmingly voted to give full moral and financial support to the Gordy Defense Committee. About a hundred members attended and reflected the hatred of Detroit's Negroes toward the city's "trigger-happy" and Negro-hating cops.

The Gordy Defense Committee is established to sustain Gordy, charged with first degree murder, in his right to protect himself and home against police terror methods.

EARLIER ACTIONS

The recent vote of the NAACP membership is but a culmination of actions taken earlier by public-spirited citizens including ministers, lawyers and doctors. These have been contacting churches and labor unions for support and have been successful in raising \$500 in a campaign just beginning.

The Detroit NAACP, in response to strong sentiment in the Negro community, stated this past week, "The recent disturbance in our community which resulted in the fatal shooting of an officer of the Detroit Police Department and the serious wounding of another, lays bare, we believe, chronic and basic ill in the relations of the community

and the Detroit Police Department. . . .

TROUBLE SPOT

"It is the trouble-spot in police behavior . . . where Negroes are concerned, a chronic indication of the evil of race prejudice. Very simply, the problem is one of improper and abusive tactics." The statement continued: "Plainly the evidence points to the following conclusions:

"The arrest of Charles Gordy Jr., without a warrant was indefensible and another glaring indication of the pattern established by members of the Detroit Police Force of indiscriminately making arrests without warrants. To have taken Gordy Jr., half-dressed, and to have handcuffed his hands behind him was a serious act of counterabuse. . . .

"Physical abuse such as knocking and striking persons on the head as they came out of the Butler residence must be condemned."

The statement concludes by proposing "strict adherence to the law of arrests and seizures without warrant," and "aside from a thorough investigation of the Gordy incident by the Police Department, a separate investigation by a citizens' committee, and a public hearing."

Top Brass



Lt. Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, Secretary of the Army Frank Pace and Gen. J. Lawton Collins pose for publicity just before they board a plane in Washington for the recent conference of Atlantic Pact governments in Brussels, Belgium. These U.S. top brass pushed the plan for rearming of capitalist Western Germany adopted by the conference.

4th International's Appeal to Yugoslav CP

(Continued from page 1)

tional antagonisms as much as possible, fight to the finish — that is our line. But this should be done without ever losing sight of the historical conditions and limitations of this necessary struggle, as well as the limits of permissible maneuvers. The struggle for socialism in Yugoslavia is subordinate to the struggle of the international working class for world socialism.

If, in the course of such a struggle, the workers state succumbed in Yugoslavia, it would not be a pure and simple defeat but an enrichment of the experience and moral capital of the international labor movement, an important stimulant for new battles and greater and decisive victories over world capitalism and all forces hostile to the revolution.

THE MARXIST LINE

Such was the line of Marx, the line of Rosa Luxemburg, the line of the Third International up to the death of Lenin, and it is also our line.

Such is not, however, the nature of the foreign policy your government has entered upon.

The building of socialism in Yugoslavia seems to be considered by your government as an end in itself which can be attained independently of this or that concession and of the repercussion of these concessions on the international labor movement.

So that Yugoslavia may benefit from the support of the capitalist majority in the UN in case of an

attack by the Kremlin armies, your government tends to view the UN only through that aspect directly linked with the immediate fate of Yugoslavia.

But the action of the UN is world-wide and certain peoples, the colonial peoples of Asia in revolt, today suffer in their very flesh from the intervention of the UN in the shape of the mercenary armies, bombs, aircraft and tanks that assault them.

ROLE OF UN

When your government depicts the UN as the supreme Assembly of peoples which can democratically decide by a majority who the "aggressor" is and then penalize him, as it did in Korea, it is actually elaborating a pernicious theory which idealizes the UN, a mere tool of imperialist policy.

For the overwhelming majority of the UN is made up of the representatives of capitalist and imperialist governments, dominated by the great imperialist powers and mainly by the U.S. and not by the peoples' representatives.

No decision of that organization will ever go counter to the fundamental interests of imperialism, of American imperialism in particular. On the contrary, imperialism uses the UN to disguise its policy of world domination under the cover of "United Nations."

Is it really necessary among Marxists to further emphasize that imperialism utilizes the UN? How then can we assign to

that organization the task of "designating" and then "punishing" the "aggressor"? First of all, this notion of "aggressor" is not in the domain of jurists and diplomats but pertains to the class struggle and to the class character of each phenomenon in our epoch. Like Marx and Lenin, we are not against all wars but against certain wars. We recognize the absolute legitimacy of wars directed by the colonial and semi-colonial peoples against imperialism and the wars of workers' states against capitalist and imperialist states. We recognize that it is possible and sometimes necessary for a workers state to give military aid to the revolutionary forces of another country so that the latter may gain victory over their class enemy.

From all these fundamental concepts of Marxism, enriched by so many past examples, how is it possible to go wrong on such a petty formal definition of the "aggressor" which is confined to the UN? Such a definition is worthy only of lawyers and jurists arguing from the viewpoint of abstract international "justice" and "law" that stands above classes and their struggles in our epoch.

LENIN AND THE LEAGUE

After the First World War the imperialists created the League of Nations which Lenin and the Third International called the "thieves' kitchen" of the imperialist bandits, and which the USSR refused to join while Lenin was alive.

It was after 1934, following the victory of German fascism, the general retreat of the world labor movement, the isolation of the USSR and the approach of war, that the Soviet bureaucracy revised the Leninist policy on the League of Nations and took the USSR into the League in order to profit by the help of "democratic" imperialism against the Axis powers. But instead of presenting the entry of the USSR as a necessity, imposed by an unfavorable international situation, and explaining that retreat to the masses, Stalin built up a theory that idealized the League and distorted its class role and character.

All development is, at bottom, explained by contradictions. Today there is an apparent contradiction in the evolution of the Yugoslav Communist Party since its break with the Kremlin, and that contradiction helps explain many questions as to where Yugoslavia is going today. This apparent contradiction consists, on the one side, of the extremely progressive trend of the CPY's internal policy, its conscious and sincere attempt to develop workers' democracy in the country, and, on the other, of the hesitant, and often false, opportunist trend of its international policy.

Of course, the CPY's break with Stalinism has brought many progressive results on the international field too. Suffice it to mention the silent correction by the CPY of its German policy in 1949, its coming over to the principle of restoring full sovereignty to the German people without interference by any of the victorious big powers. The denunciation of the way the "buffer" countries are exploited by the Soviet bureaucracy is another positive feature of Yugoslav foreign policy as it has evolved during the last two years.

FULLER UNDERSTANDING

Finally, from the point of view of the international working class movement, the Yugoslav Communists reached a thorough understanding of the reactionary role of the Soviet bureaucracy in world affairs and in the labor movement. They analyzed correctly the origins and significance of the degeneration of the Soviet Union, following very closely the lines of analysis made previously by Leon Trotsky and the international Trotskyist movement. They also arrived at a correct theory concerning the causes for the defeats and setbacks suffered by the Stalinist movement during the last years especially in Greece, Italy, France and Western Germany, a theory which is again very similar to the one elaborated by the Trotskyist parties of these countries.

The progress of the Yugoslav Communists, with regard to internal political matters, became sweeping at the beginning of 1950, leading up to the law on the workers' councils of June 28. As against this, however, the much slower evolution on issues of international policy became retarded even more, and then suddenly reversed its previous course with the launching of the peace campaign by the Yugoslav National Committee for the Defense of Peace; with the stand taken by the Yugoslav government in the UN on the Korean war, and with the general attitude of the Yugoslav UN delegation. How explain this disparity?

The basic explanation is very simple. The progressive internal development of Yugoslavia is the result of a conscious attempt by the leaders of the CPY to broaden and activate their proletarian support in face of internal and external foes. This development takes place under conditions of

increased international pressure from the Kremlin and its satellites, who first want to discredit Yugoslavia in the eyes of the international working class before trying to overthrow the regime; and at the same time pressure from the American bourgeoisie which cynically tries to utilize the Kremlin's pressure in order to extort greater and greater concessions from the Yugoslav government before granting any effective economic help.

Internally the relation of forces is, at least for the moment, thanks to the existence of the workers' state, favorable to the CPY, and allows it successfully to resist hostile pressure and even to react vigorously against it. But on the international field the reverse holds true. The relationship of forces here is overwhelmingly unfavorable to the Yugoslav revolution; and this has led the Yugoslav government to yield at least in part to the hostile pressure brought to bear upon it.

SERIOUS SETBACK

From the standpoint of the interests of the Yugoslav revolution whose conquests they want to safeguard — not to mention the interests of the international working class — the opportunist deviations of the Yugoslav leaders in foreign policy represent a serious setback and a great tragedy. They provide fuel for Stalinist slanders about "Yugoslavia's having become an American satellite" — slanders which unfortunately are still taken seriously by millions of honest Communists in France, Italy, Eastern Europe, China, the whole Far East and the USSR itself; slanders which can be only gradually exposed by the clearest possible position on the part of the Yugoslav leaders in all matters relating to foreign policy.

The present course shuts off the Yugoslav Communists from many opportunities for expansion in the working class movement, which are created by the current policy of Stalinism. It will inevitably weaken even the internal cohesion of the CPY, which is composed of thousands of real Communists, loyal to the core to Communism, who up to now have heard nothing but lies from the Stalinist propaganda agencies but who now, for the first time, have some reason for doubts

about the policy of their leadership.

Foreign pressure on the Yugoslav workers state is tremendous and is increasing unrelentingly. The Soviet bureaucracy employs against revolutionary Yugoslavia all the methods of counter-revolutionary oppressions which it has developed since its intervention in the Spanish Civil War, combining these with all the military and semi-military pressure which it can bring to bear against a small state. Military maneuvers are staged along the frontiers. Troops and armored divisions are concentrated. Military dignitaries, like Marshals Voroshilov and Malinovsky, deliver provocative speeches. Spies and wreckers are sent into the country. Industrial and military sabotage is attempted. A furious campaign of slander and denigration is conducted by all the radio stations of the USSR and the satellite countries.

All this forces the Yugoslav Communists to be constantly on guard, to keep a large army in a constant state of preparedness, to increase military expenditures and broaden counter-espionage, and to devote to all this much more attention, funds, manpower and cadres than the development of the country toward full workers' democracy can afford.

On the other hand, the imperialist powers, granting reluctantly an occasional loan, let months pass before negotiating new ones, postpone for months the payment of loans granted, and follow a line of letting the economic situation of the country deteriorate, to the point where some big concessions can be extorted. The immediate aims of this imperialist pressure are clear: to draw Yugoslavia into the military schemes of Anglo-American imperialism in the Mediterranean; to obtain military bases; to legalize some bourgeois political parties which would help from within to pull the country in the same direction; to wring from the Yugoslav government guarantees for such a course; to commit the Yugoslav government to a pledge that in case of military aggression by the Kremlin, Yugoslavia would allow U.S. troops (disguised as "UN troops") on its soil. The ultimate goal of this pressure is the outright restoration of capitalism in the country, the overthrow of the dictatorship

of the proletariat and of the government of the CPY.

Because of their whole past in the school of Stalinism; because of their lack of knowledge and experience with the international labor movement, and because of their lack of clarity on some basic theoretical questions, the Yugoslav Communist leaders grossly underestimate the present possibilities of revolutionary developments on a world scale, capable of coming to the aid of Socialist Yugoslavia in the not too distant future. But right now this perspective cannot solve any of the difficulties created for them by external pressure. Right now it is necessary for the class-conscious workers throughout the world to undertake concrete actions in order to relieve the pressure which is being exerted against the first country since the October Revolution which at least is trying to develop a genuine workers' democracy.

Whatever our criticism of the unfortunate trend which the foreign policy of Yugoslavia has taken, we must clearly understand one thing: A HEAVY RESPONSIBILITY RESTS UPON THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING CLASS. It will be impossible, in the long run, for the Communist movement which conquered power in so small and backward a country as Yugoslavia to retain power if that revolution remains isolated and if the international working class does not defend it against its mighty foes.

Class-conscious workers in the U.S., in Canada, in Great Britain, in Australia and elsewhere should demand that their governments immediately send to Yugoslavia large quantities of unused stockpiles of food without conditions, and without payment. They must denounce the cynical pressure methods of secret diplomacy designed to wring reactionary concessions from the Yugoslav revolution. They should arouse the maximum of attention, of interest, of passionate concern for the development of that revolution inside the mass organizations of their country. They should organize large delegations from trade unions, from the cooperative movement and other mass movements, to go to Yugoslavia, to report back before membership meetings, to get the whole organized labor movement of their countries to bring pressure upon their respective governments to give AID TO YUGOSLAVIA WITH NO STRINGS ATTACHED. Mass meetings and mass demonstrations should be organized for that purpose.

The more successful such a campaign is, the more the Yugoslav Communist leaders would learn of the real strength and possibilities of the international labor movement, and the more they would themselves be placed in a position of reorienting their own international policy and drawing closer to the world working class. By its concrete results and by its ideological effect upon the Yugoslav Communists, such an immediate mobilization of the international working class for the defense of Yugoslavia is the most effective, if not the sole, way of assuring a new progressive stage in the development of the Yugoslav revolution.

(Next Week: How Could It Happen?)

Local Addresses Of Socialist Workers Party

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

BOSTON—Workers Educational Center, 20 Stuart Street, Boston 2, 5:30-9 P.M. Social list Sat. of every month.

BUFFALO—Millant Forum, 622 Main Street, Buffalo 2, 8 P.M. Open except Sun. Phone Madison 3-600.

CHICAGO—165 W. Washington St., Rm 312-314. Open 4-7 P.M. Open except Sun. 8-10 P.M. CLEVELAND—Decker's Hall, 1446 E. 82nd St. (off Wade Park Ave.), every Sun. 8 P.M.

DETROIT—6108 Linwood Ave. Open Mon. through Sat., 12-5 P.M. Phone TY 2-6822.

ELINT—SWIFT, 1507 Oak Street, Phone 22495.

LOS ANGELES—Millant Pub. Acft. Rm 323, 124 W. 6th St. Phone Vandale 8061.

MILWAUKEE—317 N. 3rd St., 3rd fl. Open Thurs., 8 P.M. Phone Madison 4-2037.

MINNEAPOLIS—10 South 4th St. Open daily except Sun. 10 A.M.-6 P.M. Library, bookstore, Phone Main 7781.

NEW HAVEN—For information, write P.O. Box 1019.

NEWARK—123 Springfield Avenue, Phone AL 2-8222.

NEW YORK CITY—Rm. 2, 116 University Place, Phone AL 2-8222.

BROOKLYN — De Luxe Palace, 558 Howard Ave., near Lewis's Pitkin. Meeting every Thurs., 8 P.M.

HARLEM—103 W. 110th St. Rm 25. Open discussion, every Thurs., 8 P.M.

OAKLAND (Cal.) — For information write P.O. Box 1955, or call TBomphar 2-3733.

PHILADELPHIA — 1203-05 W. Girard Ave., 2nd fl. Open every Fri. evening. Phone Stevenson 4-5820.

PITTSBURGH—For information, write P.O. Box 382.

ST. LOUIS—For information, Phone MT 107.

SAN FRANCISCO—1730 Fillmore Ave., 4th fl. Open daily except Sun., 12-4:30 P.M. Phone 371-6410.

SEATTLE—Maynard Bldg., 1st Ave. So. and Washington, Rm 201. Open Mon. through Sat., 12-5 P.M. Branch meeting every Thurs., 7:30 P.M. Library, bookstore, Phone Main 9278.

TOLEDO—For information, write P.O. Box 1502.

YOUNGSTOWN — 234 E. Federal St. Call 3-1778.

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

Subscriptions: \$2 per year;
\$1 for 6 months. Foreign:
\$3.50 per yr.; \$2 for 6 mos.
"Entered as second class
matter Mar. 7, 1914 at the
Post Office at New York,
N. Y., under the act of Mar.
3, 1879."

THE MILITANT

Published Weekly in the Interests of the Working People
THE MILITANT PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION
116 University Pl., N. Y. 3, N. Y. Phone: AL 5-7400
Editor: GEORGE BREITMAN
Business Manager: JOSEPH HANSEN

Single Orders (5 or more
copies): 3c each in U.S., 4c
each in foreign countries.
Signed articles by contribu-
tors do not necessarily rep-
resent The Militant's policies.
These are expressed in its
editorials.

Vol. XV — No. 1

Monday, January 1, 1951



TROTSKY

On Colonial Uprisings and Wars

"Plundering the natural wealth of the backward countries and deliberately restraining their independent industrial development, the monopolistic magnates and their governments simultaneously grant financial, political and military support to the most reactionary, parasitic, semi-feudal groups of native exploiters. . . . The fight of the colonial peoples for their liberation, passing over the intervening stages, transforms itself of necessity into a fight against imperialism, and thus aligns with the struggle of the proletariat in the mother countries. Colonial uprisings and wars in their turn rock the foundations of the capitalist world more than ever and render the miracle of its regeneration less than ever possible."

— Leon Trotsky, Living Thoughts of Karl Marx, 1938.



LENIN

Bring the Troops Back Now

More tens of thousands of American boys are being condemned to wounds and death in Truman's "police action" by Washington's decision to keep the U.S. troops fighting in an "inch-by-inch" retreat until they are driven out of the Korean peninsula.

Announced American casualties are already past 42,000 and this figure is admittedly weeks behind the actual toll. Of course, the war-makers don't even bother to count the Korean casualties — estimated at more than a million in South Korea alone, some 80% of them civilians burned and blasted by U.S. "saturation" bombings, according to a statement of the South Korean government.

Remember this frightful slaughter is in an undeclared war that Truman initiated without consultation of Congress, let alone consent of the American people. Now Truman's policy of an "inch-by-inch" retreat comes as the brutal answer to the tearful pleas of mothers, fathers and wives of the soldiers in Korea to "bring our boys back home."

If you search the hearts of the average Americans, we believe you will find they do not feel Truman's intervention

in Korea is just and righteous. Despite intimidation and repression that has imposed silence on the American people, signs are multiplying daily that they have no sympathy for interference with the Asian people, who are in upsurge against foreign domination and age-old tyrannies.

The capitalist politicians in Washington, the glory-seeking militarists, the war profiteers are contemptuously disregarding the popular sentiment here and throughout the world. They are bent on a "limited war," which is war to the limit of the present military power of the U.S. and preparations for unlimited war when American imperialism feels ready.

That isn't what the American people want. They want a stop to the war in Korea right now. They are against a "limited" or any other kind of war. Their boys will be just as dead either way. They want them alive and well and safe out of the bloody mess. And they don't give a damn about saving the face of Truman and MacArthur, either. They want the troops withdrawn from Korea immediately.

For Escalator Clauses in All Contracts

One and a half million workers now have escalator clauses in their union contracts. The four operating railroad brotherhoods are the latest to obtain an automatic sliding scale of wages.

Top leaders of the CIO, AFL and Railroad Brotherhoods recently endorsed the escalator clause as a means of protecting workers' living standards against price rises. If they are giving more than lip service to this proposal, they will proceed at once to demand the reopening of all wage contracts, covering all 16 million organized workers, so that their real wages may be safeguarded by automatic contractual provisions.

Thus far the union leadership has made no move to provide this minimum protection for the vast majority of organized labor. Nor have they insisted, as they should, upon the incorporation of the same principle in federal old age and unemployment benefits.

There is no excuse for this failure to fight aggressively for such clauses throughout industry. If living costs do not go up, wages will not rise under escalator agreements. But should living costs rise, the workers will have at least a chance to keep up in part with the increase in prices.

The Wage Stabilization Board may cancel all escalator clauses in March, 1951, when most unions which have a sliding scale of wages in their agreements, are

entitled to a quarterly wage increase based upon the increased cost of living.

There is not the slightest excuse for the cancellation of existing escalator clauses. Government officials promise to "stabilize" the cost of living. Unless they intend to renege on their promise, why should they cancel the escalator clause?

The existing escalator clauses are by no means a guarantee that living standards of the workers covered will be maintained. They depend upon the notoriously inaccurate Bureau of Labor Statistics cost-of-living index; they do not protect workers' incomes against the deep slashes made by taxation; they do not take into consideration deterioration of goods, and similar hidden ways of undermining real wages. But the escalator clause is a step in the right direction. In World War II wages were frozen by the government's "Little Steel Formula" to 15% above the Jan. 1, 1941 level. This wage freeze, as every worker knows, lowered labor's living standards while prices and profits soared. American workers also recall the fraudulent "equality of sacrifice" program.

The Wage Stabilization Board will seize upon any weakness shown by organized labor to enforce wage freezing. Union leaders should fight now to incorporate escalator clauses in every union contract and thereby give every union man and woman a stake in the fight to maintain real wages against the attack of rising prices.

Truman and Tamerlane

President Truman, speaking in Kansas City Dec. 23, donned a mantle of righteousness, calling for "those people who believe in ethics, morals and right" to band together. A "moral mobilization" was urgent, he said, to meet the menace of the "inheritors of Genghis Khan and Tamerlane. . . the greatest murderers in the history of the world." This attempt to identify the Chinese and Korean people with the Mongol conquerors of the 12th and 14th Centuries is a revealing outburst of racist venom — one more insult to the Asian masses now struggling for their independence.

To fling this racial insult, one must stoop low indeed. Truman falsified Asian history. He attributed to Genghis Khan and Tamerlane the title "greatest murderers in the history of the world." It is true that Genghis Khan and Tamerlane marshalled huge armies and conquered half the world, leaving death and destruction in their wake.

But in more recent times, so fresh in memory that the peoples of the whole world still tremble from its awesome effects, Truman unleashed the weapon which carried in one blow more death than the combined armies of all the Mongol warlords.

It was Truman, not Tamerlane, let alone Genghis Khan, who gave the order to load the bellies of B-29 super-fortresses with Atom-Bombs; it was Truman who gave the signal to release those bombs.

It was this imperialist champion of "ethics and morals" who bears the responsibility for the greatest mass killing in world history — the annihilation of the men, women and children of Nagasaki and Hiroshima.

Tamerlane's armies slaughtered with sword and spear. Truman felled whole cities with the weapon of atomic fission; in his wake he left mountains of corpses, a wilderness of disfigured, blinded, disintegrating, walking dead.

The menace to civilization does not come from the Chinese and Korean peoples, fighting for their independence from foreign domination. It comes from Truman, who again threatens mass murder with even more destructive bombs.

Who throws fear into the hearts of all humanity? The masses of Asia who want only to defend their right to be free from foreign exploiters, or Truman and his capitalist warlords who are building a stockpile of A-Bombs and Hell-Bombs?

Hoover's Speech Shows Rulers Split on Tactics

By John G. Wright

The action of the House and Senate Republicans pressing for the resignation of Secretary of State Acheson was sandwiched in between two major opposition speeches: the one by John P. Kennedy, former Ambassador to London on Dec. 12; the other by ex-President Hoover on Dec. 20. All three are part of the battle over foreign policy that will be fought out inside and outside the 82nd Congress convening this week.

The Hoover-Kennedy speeches amid the continued campaign for Acheson's removal underscore how sharp is the division among the ruling capitalist circles. Feelings are indeed running high; the interchange of epithets grows more and more unrestrained; the need for unity among the imperialists more pressing. Nevertheless, disunity persists.

VIOLENT DEBATE

N. Y. Times' political expert James Reston foresees a debate that is "bound to be violent." The veteran Arthur Krock, of the same authoritative paper, warns that any attempt by the administration to disregard the opposition "would surely produce a constitutional crisis."

In a Senate that is almost evenly divided, the Republicans are in a position to force the administration to alter its foreign policy by the simple expedient of blocking funds for foreign programs.

What is at stake is not at all a reversal of foreign policy, but merely a modification of it. Both sides are, of course, pretending that more than tactics are involved here. That a difference over tactical questions could prove so serious is itself a sign of the political blind alley in which American capitalism finds itself. And, indeed, both the bitterness of the dispute and the sharpness of the division, which cuts across both the Democratic and Republican parties, are outward expressions of the same political crisis.

NOT ISOLATIONISM

Suffice it to say that the usualist N.Y. Times not only denounces Hoover's line as expressing "futility and frustration," but deems the occasion important enough to drop its mask of a lover of truth. Hoover-Kennedy

2,000 Votes for Swedish Trotskyists

At the recently held municipal elections in Stockholm, Sweden, the Trotskyist candidate received some 2,000 votes.

This was the first time that a Trotskyist candidate has run in the Swedish elections.

INDONESIA LABOR SHOWS STRENGTH IN STRUGGLES

(Continued from Page 1)

placed in the hands of people's cooperatives. Still another—that representatives of the toilers be included in the municipal governing body. Finally, an ultimatum was issued to the government to accede to these various demands, otherwise the neighborhood committees would refuse to recognize the government any longer.

On the political plane, the dominant issue in the revolutionary movement is the uniting of the Republic of Indonesia with that section of New Guinea which is still under Dutch dominion. A huge demonstration was held in the capital city of Jakarta at the time of the departure to The Hague of the Indonesian parliamentary delegation which was to negotiate on this matter with the Dutch.

It is noteworthy that the Dutch Communist Party has come out against this unification and in favor of a mandate over New Guinea exercised by the "Big Five"; in the eyes of the Stalinists, supplying the USSR with a military base is more important than taking into account the wishes and aspirations of the colonial masses struggling for their emancipation.

PARTY OF EXTREME LEFT

Discernible in the entire revolutionary agitation which is now shaking Indonesia are the distinctive character and role of the previously mentioned revolutionary party of the extreme left — Partai Murba. This party numbers among its leaders many of the former leaders of the Indonesian Communist Party who had rebuilt that party in 1945 but who broke with Stalinism when the latter came out in favor of the compromises with imperialism (the treaties of Renville and Linggadjati).

"urge withdrawal from Europe and Asia," charge the Times editors. Hoover took care to parry such barefaced distortions in advance. "These policies I have suggested would be no isolationism. Indeed, they are the opposite," he said. And for a change, he was not lying himself.

Hoover and the circles he speaks for have not the slightest intention of withdrawing from Asia. Personally, Hoover has been plumping for a separate peace with Japan since 1947. He now vehemently favors the rearmament of Japan. In January 1950 he called for the seizure of Formosa by force. His Dec. 20 speech shows that he has not changed his mind and that, besides, he heartily approves Truman-Acheson's course in this connection.

Where Hoover has placed a big question mark is not so much over the Korean adventure and the inadvisability of trying to hold a "bridge-head" on the Asian mainland. He placed it over similar attempts or commitments in continental Europe. Involved here is military expediency. Hoover concludes that lacking the necessary land armies in Europe, as in Korea, the threat of the A-Bomb will prove "a far less dominant weapon than it is once thought to be." Hence he is in favor, as in Korea, of a tactical retreat in Europe, but only up to a certain point.

SPEAKS FOR MANY

And here Hoover speaks not only for a strong group of anti-administration Republicans but for a much broader alignment. According to the informed Krock "in influential Washington quarters, including the military, strong doubts exist" about the reliability of the French and the Italians as military allies, and even about West German rearmament.

Far from wishing to withdraw from Europe, Hoover proposes to press for "a maximum of cooperation" with its "Commonwealth of 150,000,000 people." As for continental Europe, he urges "a period of watchful waiting." He wants to replace the "coddling" policy of the administration by a "tough" policy which relies "on far more than pacts, conferences, paper promises and declarations." Thereby he hopes to achieve the integration of Franco Spain and a rearmament Germany with huge Atlantic Pact armies. "And that before we land another man or another dollar on their shores," he insists.

ECONOMIC COLLAPSE

What frightens Hoover and many others is not only the military inexperience of trying to hold "bridge-heads" in Western

Europe, but also the fantastic cost and the perilous economic consequences entailed in such a venture. "If we continued long on this road the one center of resistance in the world will collapse in economic disaster," Hoover warned, voicing the alarm in many financial and industrial quarters.

FEAR OF KREMLIN

Finally, it will take time to convert Western Europe into a vast drill-ground. The most hopeful estimates call for three years. But where are the guarantees that the Kremlin will meanwhile sit by with folded arms? What if Moscow should refuse to wait? Hoover expresses these fears of all European chancelleries by his formula of "inviting another Korea."

Hoover's proposals, as Krock points out, "reflect very wide public opinion in this country." The administration's course, on the contrary, is becoming increasingly unpopular. And this only renders the political crisis all the more acute.

But Hoover's proposals, just as the administration policy, leave more problems unsolved than they succeed in settling. American imperialism cannot afford a policy of no retreat; but neither can retreats be afforded. Like the administration policy, Hoover's "arming to the teeth," creating "hemispheric Gibraltar" and the like, leave unsolved the problem of problems. Monopolist America must find world outlets for her superfluity of capital or perish. But how?



HERBERT HOOVER

NAZI GENERALS TO HEAD RESTORED WEHRMACHT IN GERMAN REARMING

(Continued from Page 1)

Western "democracy," is the right to reestablish its armaments industry and "a German army and a German army general staff." Baillie added, "I think they will get them all, but not right away."

If the army is not yet available, the general staff is. Adenauer demonstratively named to his committee to discuss military affairs with the Allies two of Hitler's most notorious generals, Lt. Gen. Adolf Heusinger, former chief of operations of the Wehrmacht, and Lt. Gen. Hans Speidel, Chief of Staff to Field Marshal Erwin Rommel. Adenauer's own special military adviser is ex-Panzer general, Gerhard von Schwerin. These and a flock of other Nazi generals are already working with the Allied high command.

It is by no means guaranteed that the German rearmament plan, desperately pushed by Washington, will be speedily fulfilled. Among the Big Three powers, and among all three and Bonn there are all manner of suspicions and doubts. The French, for instance, suspect the U.S. and Britain of planning to base themselves on German military power at the expense of France's position. The Germans fear the Allies may make a temporary deal with the Soviet Union at Germany's expense. The Allies wonder whether a strengthened Western Germany may not seek an understanding with the Kremlin. All the defenders of "democracy" are wary of a double-cross.

THE GERMAN PEOPLE

But the greatest barrier to German rearmament and restoration of the Wehrmacht is the German people. They are overwhelmingly opposed to being used as a cat's paw by Western imperialism. They are increasingly vehement in their opposition to becoming cannon fodder for the ambitious German general staff and the rejuvenated German capitalists.

The German workers, still living in the rubble and ruins of

THERE IS REASON IN THIS ECONOMIC LUNACY

By Fred Hart

When the American billionaires plunged into the last war, they possessed a good many unimpaired assets, not the least among them, the solidity and solvency of their monetary and fiscal system. Even so, the dollar did not emerge unscathed, losing easily 40% of its prewar purchasing power. And this despite the imposing wartime expansion of the country's productive capacity.

Among the main factors which have up to now obscured the pre-Korea debasement of U.S. currency and, by this token, the weakening of the U.S. fiscal system has been the collapse of the major competing currencies and fiscal systems. As the currency of the only solvent power in a world of capitalist bankrupts, the Dollar appeared unscathed, nay, even more potent than ever. But it is far from being the same monetary unit it used to be, nor is it backed by as strong a fiscal system.

And yet experts, strategists and statesmen in Washington have acted as if nothing at all happened. Within a few months after Korea, the annual budget edges up to the 75 billion dollar mark and Truman blandly comments that this falls far short of a "genuine" war budget.

At the peak of postwar "prosperity" in 1948 the whole annual income hovered at around 225 billion. A 75 billion dollar budget, therefore, must consume, more accurately waste, approximately one-third of this country's real annual production. No capitalist government ever undertook such vast expenditures without first imposing the most rigorous regulations and controls, if only to safeguard its monetary and fiscal structure. But not so the Truman administration and the billionaires whom he represents.

The current inflation is, of course, being primarily fed by deficit government spending. But it is not only the astronomical national debt of more than 260 billion that represents a danger. State and local governments have been piling it on as well. Last Dec. 1 the Census Bureau reported that when the Korean war had just begun "state and local governments had piled up a debt of 23.6 billion, the greatest ever. . . . Not so many years ago, this amounted to more than the whole federal budget, more than the entire national debt."

To these public debts must be added many scores of billions that are owed privately (business and personal loans, farm and home mortgages, home equipment and other goods bought on the installment plan, etc.) — not to mention the still-to-be-appropriated billions for war expenditures and "civilian defense" which can be financed only by further federal, state and local borrowing.

Can't Bear It Indefinitely

How long can any fiscal structure bear such a load? Not indefinitely. In the opinion of such firm believers in "free enterprise" as Herbert Hoover, "we might with stern measures avoid the economic disintegration of such a load for a very few years." These "stern measures," Hoover mentioned in passing in his Dec. 20 speech, mean nothing less than the imposition of an economic dictatorship, exceeding in depth and scope anything previously attempted in the way of "regulating" capitalist economy, even in Hitler's Germany.

Then why have the arrogant rulers permitted their mad dance of the billions to be stepped up so recklessly? For a whole number of reasons. For one thing, because it is only a question of time before they will proceed to impose what Hoover calls "stern measures." Many among them, too, are banking on a productive expansion, such as occurred during the last war. An expansion would, of course, provide a major safeguard against economic catastrophe. Nor would the manpower shortage, bound to become quite acute, prove an insurmountable obstacle. At current rates of employment and production every hour's increase is equal to 375,000 men added to the labor force.

And this brings us to the hard core of the economic insanity of the monopolists. They are banking, before all, on the available "reserves," namely: the working and living conditions of the American people. They confidently expect to save their economy and their outlived rule by unloading everything on the backs of the masses — everything, from the full costs of their war, through the overhead expenses of a dangerously inflated credit system, down to dollars debased to the value of pennies.

the last war, are not likely to accept the onerous conditions of German rearmament. Rearmament will mean, according to "authoritative German sources" quoted by the AP, "drastic curbing of civilian consumption." These sources have declared that "the Germans are ready to shoulder their share of the economic hardships" which rearmament will entail.

WHAT BONN REGIME WANTS

Rearmament is desired by the Bonn regime as a means of suppressing and grinding down the German masses for the benefit of the German capitalists. Hitler is gone, but the class that put him in power remains. Its aims were summed up by Adenauer's Minister of the Interior, Dr. Lehr, who told a meeting of industrialists: "We need an army not merely for defense against the East but also for defense against the excessive wage demands of the trade unions."

Allied and Stalinist propaganda in the last war justified the occupation of Germany and crushing of the German people on the theory of "collective guilt" and the "inherent militarism" of all Germans. Today, it is the slanderers of the German people who seek to revive German militarism, while the people resist it most desperately.

"Collective guilt" is not the only monstrous lie of the last war which is refuted by the moves to rearm Germany. Today, Soviet Foreign Minister Vishinsky complains that "it is incomprehensible that anyone can rearm a nation that is a former enemy of war." But what is the Kremlin doing in

East Germany? Moreover did not Stalin and Vishinsky urge the workers to support the "democratic" imperialists in the last war to "destroy German militarism and Nazism?" Did not Stalin, in cooperation first with Hitler and then with the Western capitalist powers, help to crush the German revolution that would have guaranteed the permanent destruction of German capitalist militarism?

CALCULATED RISK

For Western imperialism the "reliability" of the German ruling class as an ally is a matter of "calculated risk." The plain truth is that capitalist Germany — and capitalist Japan in the Far East, it may be added — are indispensable to any military offensive against the Soviet Union. The N. Y. Times admits editorially that "effective Atlantic defense. . . is impossible without German manpower and resources." In this decisive sense, Western imperialism is compelled to find its most "reliable" allies precisely in its former enemies, but class brothers.

SPECIAL PRICE --- \$1.00

(limited, time only)

LEON TROTSKY presents

THE LIVING THOUGHTS OF KARL MARX-184 pp.
What is the future of American Capitalism? An analysis of this question in the foreword introduces a concise presentation of Marx's economic teachings.

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

116 University Place New York 3, N. Y.
Latest Catalogue on Request

Christmas Was Like This

By Theodore Kovalesky

In the city there was snow and strangeness. There was ruin and terror. There were clanking, long-snouted machines that crushed their way over the snow on frozen roads. There were snarling planes that whipped across the sky like smoky comets, carrying swifter death than no longer crashed into the shattered city but sped away elsewhere, somewhere to the north. There were strange men in strange clothing who carried death with them on the ground as they peered into the broken houses, and marched through the black and white pattern of snow and long-cold embers, ice and fire-gutted buildings, and spoke short, tough words in a strange tongue.

There were others, too, that marched in the city. Daily they marched, always in the same direction, always at the hour of noon or an hour later, always in the same direction, but never back.

In the room there was darkness and cold and the sound of breath from many bodies. Other sounds were few. Few words were spoken. The time for words was past. The time for planning, for loving, for working, fighting, even for living was past. Only a few tattered shreds of time were left, and these were just for a little waiting. And after the waiting, the door would open, and there would be the rifles, the soldiers, the wolf-like bark of command, and another bowed, silent company would start its one-way march at the hour of noon or an hour later.

Next to the wall, near the door the man sat with his family, surrounded, half smothered by men and women and children of the other families. It was dark in the room, and he was unsure of the time, so he raised his eyes at every sound outside. The man felt little. There was little that he could feel. . . now. Perhaps a vague gratefulness, a shadowy satisfaction, because at least his family was together. Beside him, pressed hard against him in the crowd, sat his wife, silent and dry-eyed, and before him his two sons, the older a boy of eight, and the other, the tiny child, just four. What would they do to him? Surely an infant like that could not be a Communist, a Red, an Enemy of the Republic? But then, his wife! What had she done? She knew nothing of politics, she had done nothing, yet she would die.

The door was kicked open. He saw and heard them, the weapons, the men, the wolf-barks. He had known of it. He had seen it happen to others before that night when the soldiers of the Republic of South Korea had burst in, beaten him, kicked his wife, slapped the children into whimpering quiet, and dragged the family to the Room. He had seen it, he had heard the rifles, so today he knew how it would be.

There were no words. Strange, that at the last, the very last there should be nothing to say. But that is the way it was. The silence of the grave had prematurely fallen. And when once he spoke a word of comfort to the four-year-old in his arms his wife turned to look at him, and there was no message in her eyes.

The slow march ended. Behind them lay a ditch hacked into the frozen ground, and behind that the land stretched away, white and gray, into the north.

The man wondered about the little one. For the other, the eight-year-old, there could be no doubt. He would lie that night in the ditch with his parents. But the little one? What of him?

A soldier of Syngman Rhee snapped at him, and with a surge of gratitude mingling with the heart-stab of separation he handed the now sobbing child over to the soldier.

It was as he had himself seen it. They stood one moment at the edge of the ditch. The soldiers raised their rifles. The next moment he was flung gasping and struggling into the ground, his own blood drenching his hands. He was very cold and in breathless agony, and it seemed that he stayed alive for a long, long time.

The four-year-old yelped when the rifles crashed, and broke away from the grinning officer, but when he ran to the ditch, a soldier kicked him away from it.

Later, when the soldiers had gone, he approached it again, but men came to shovel the earth into it, and he held back whimpering until they went away. Then, bewildered, cold, hungry, he hung around the silent brown welt of soil.

For a long while he stayed there. Then, as the Twenty-fifth of December, 1950, darkened and sank into night the child turned and wandered back through the wind toward the city of Seoul.

Asia's Monroe Doctrine

By George Lavan

Indian diplomats in the UN have stated that China is moving towards the formulation of "a Monroe Doctrine for Asia." As every schoolboy knows, the Monroe Doctrine is the cornerstone of U.S. foreign policy. How can China be copying the U.S.?

First we must go back in history and see what the Monroe Doctrine was originally and how it came about.

After the defeat of Napoleon the European continent was dominated by the Holy Alliance. This combination of reactionary monarchs was dedicated to wiping out all vestiges of the French Revolution and republicanism. They proceeded to restore divine-right kings to rule over the peoples of Europe. As with reactionaries throughout history, they claimed to be acting from the highest and most religious of motives. Their restoration of tyrants, policing of Europe and jailing of republicans was based, they sanctimoniously declared, "on the sublime truths which the Holy Religion of our Savior teaches."

This reaction, raging in Europe, threatened to reach across the Atlantic Ocean. The Spanish colonies of South and Central America, aided by Spain's involvement in the Napoleonic Wars, had revolted. Postwar attempts by the Spanish king to regain his colonies failed as revolutionary armies won victory after victory.

In this situation the Holy Alliance began preparations to subjugate the insurgent Latin-Americans for the King of Spain.

Popular sympathy in the United States had long been on the side of the Latin-American revolutionists — who were referred to, even by the president, as "our Southern brethren." The people of the U.S., remembering with pride their own Revolution for Independence and a Republic, felt a strong bond of solidarity with the new independence fighters to the south.

In December 1823 President Monroe proclaimed to the world that the U.S. would not tolerate any attempt by European powers to reduce the newly established Latin-American Republics to the status of colonies. Furthermore, he declared, the Western hemisphere was off limits for European powers entertaining any ideas of carving out new colonies. Any violation of this Doctrine, Monroe warned, would lead to war with the U.S.

Faced with this U.S. warning and a possible balance-of-power war with Britain, the Holy Alliance gave up its planned reconquest of Spanish America.

The historical analogy between the U.S. of the 1820's and modern China, while far from complete, can be readily seen. Asia, like our Western hemisphere of two centuries ago, was long a land of colonies. Today, however, a revolutionary wave is sweeping the Orient. Its primary aim is independence from foreign rule. This is evidenced by the liberation struggles of the Indonesians, the Viet-Namense, etc.

In these struggles the native independence forces have shown themselves strong enough to cope with the armies of their immediate colonial masters. However, in each case victory has been made more difficult or even unachieved because the present-day powerhouse of world reaction — American imperialism — finances and supplies the slavemasters in their wars of reconquest. This was true, for example, in Indonesia — where the independence victory has been limited to only a part of the Indonesian archipelago, and in Indo-China where the battle still rages. Now the question is being publicly broached of American armed intervention against the insurgent people of Indo-China.

Alexander I, Czar of all the Russias, the moving spirit of the Holy Alliance, offered the highest moral and religious motives for his foreign policy. Today Harry S. Truman paints U.S. policy in Asia as supremely holy and moral. In neither case did moral or ethical considerations determine the policy. But morality always is a desirable smokescreen for foreign policy. Since the war is being waged on the "moral" front, how will China fare on this field?

China appears to have found a morally unsailable weapon in the Monroe Doctrine. All arguments of U.S. diplomats proving the "immorality" of a Monroe Doctrine for Asia would at the same time be a repudiation of U.S. policy on the Western hemisphere since 1823.

If the U.S. had the right then to tell the European powers that colonial restoration attempts or empire-carving adventures in the Western hemisphere meant war, then China today has the right to do the same for Asia.

Not only is a Monroe Doctrine for Asia a powerful diplomatic argument (because revolutionary China has the strength to back it up) but it is completely on the side of progress. The peoples of Asia, colonial slaves for so long, have every right to rule themselves without interference from U.S. imperialists or their junior partners in Europe.

Short Subjects

HEAT OFF GENERAL ELECTRIC — Just a few days before Charles E. Wilson, president of General Electric, announced that he had agreed to take over the job of war mobilization head, J. Howard McGrath asked the court to postpone action for five years against GE for violation of the anti-trust laws. Government service pays off for these big industrialists in more ways than one.

ASIANS REFUSED BURIAL — Fort Lincoln Cemetery, one of Washington's largest, has adopted a policy of refusing to bury persons of Asian descent. The discriminatory policy was revealed when Akira Nose, a veteran, asked the cemetery officials for a plot of ground to bury his father. The Japanese-American Citizenship Committee protested the action to the Capitol Cemetery Company, owners of the Fort Lincoln cemetery, and were told the ban "was approved by the board" because of "some objections about Chinese being buried there."

PAKISTAN TROTSKYISTS — News has arrived of the formation of a Trotskyist organization in Pakistan. Its strongest section is in Karachi. The new organization publishes a paper entitled *The New Spark*.

NAACP PROTESTS APPOINTMENT — The NAACP has announced its opposition to the appointment of former Florida Governor Millard F. Caldwell as head of the Civilian Defense program. Caldwell now holds the post by Truman's

appointment; to make it permanent, Senate confirmation is required. Charging that Caldwell was the "chief architect of a program of segregation" employed to get around a Supreme Court decision against discrimination in colleges, the NAACP said: "If a bomb drops, we do not want regulations that require colored citizens to run ten blocks to a separate racial shelter when one designated for 'white only' is just around the corner."

GM MAKES BIGGEST PROFIT — Shortly after Chairman Alfred P. Sloan of General Motors proclaimed that high taxes were killing industry, the company announced its profits for the first nine months of 1950. The net profit was over \$700 million. That is a higher profit than has ever been earned by any corporation in the world in a full year. If GM profits continued at the same rate for the balance of 1950 they should hit a billion. Last year GM made \$656 million after taxes.

NEW TAX SET-UP — The CIO News in a survey Dec. 25, estimates that under the present tax structure a far greater burden will be born by the people in relation to corporation taxes, than during the last war. In the 1944-45 period it is reported that the people paid 62.2% of the taxes and the big corporations 37.8%. In 1950, the CIO paper estimates, the people will pay 70.1% and the corporations 29.9%. The CIO News concludes that Big Business is set for another "Gravy Train" ride.

VOLUME XV

MONDAY, JANUARY 1, 1951

NUMBER 1

Detroit Housing at Wretched Level Survey Reveals

By Patricia Stall

DETROIT — The Detroit Housing Commission has just released figures which show that 750,000 people are ill-housed in this city. "Ill-housed" is a very feeble and misleading term, however, for the conditions that exist in one of the largest and most modern cities of our day.

The real misery behind this phrase lies in the words of mothers who complain that "as much snow was coming through the roof of the house . . . as was falling on the ground." Families have to put up with basements covered with three feet of sewage, and people are forced to move into a private dwelling already subdivided to house four families and find it being further subdivided to house seven with one bathroom to share with fifteen others.

PRIMITIVE HOMES

The survey stated that at least 250,000 persons were living in substandard dwellings, by which they mean dwellings which are dilapidated or those that don't have inside toilets, baths or running water. Twice that number are living in standard dwellings under substandard conditions which occur when two or more families occupy a unit designed to house only one family.

Not only do 750,000 people have to put up with such deplorable conditions but they have to pay bonuses and exorbitant rents for the "privilege" of sharing their porches with rats, their kitchens with strangers, regardless of their health or standards of cleanliness. They must share their waking and sleeping hours with the noises of countless families pressed in on each other.

NEW ARRIVALS

It can be seen that conditions are bad but they are going to get even worse. Thousands of workers are coming to Detroit lured by the promises of war work and high wages. With each new arrival the housing problem becomes worse. "An all-out war effort would make the job of housing the influx of workers practically impossible," an official of the Housing Commission stated. He added that there are more than 6,000 families on lists waiting to get into public housing units. The survey showed that 16 management companies operating large apartment buildings containing 11,378 dwelling units had only three vacancies during November and waiting lists of 1,950 families.

It is ironic that this report came out on Dec. 7, the anniversary of official entry into World War II, the war of the golden promises. How do these promises look when seen under the light of cold, hard facts? It is no wonder that the workers have no confidence in the war aims given for World War III and look with suspicion at those who would push them onto another battlefield.

It is also no wonder they don't want to sacrifice the little they have for the all-out war now threatening. Through bitter experience the lesson is being learned: The politicians, bosses and pie-in-the-sky promoters will never help the workers.

TRUMAN OPENS WAGE-FREEZE DRIVE

(Continued from Page 1)

president of the CIO United Auto Workers, has chosen to interpret this to mean that any permanent freeze order "will provide for protection of our cost-of-living and annual improvement factor."

That is by no means assured. Certainly, the administration has been forced to give pause, in this instance, before throwing out the UAW's escalator clauses. It cannot afford, at this stage, to provoke the anger and revolt of a million militant auto workers. But what about the overwhelming majority of workers who do not have escalator clause contracts? Can the administration, which expects to finance its stupendous war program out of the workers' living standards, permit the extension of escalator clauses throughout industry?

MAJOR STRUGGLE

This is the issue with which the administration is still grappling: if it bars the escalator clause to the auto workers, it will confront a major labor struggle; if it permits the auto workers to retain this protective clause, how can it deny all other workers the right to the same protection? The effectiveness of any wage

freeze — which the administration is determined to put into effect — would be materially reduced if the escalator clause were included in all union contracts. Yet the financing of the war requires a drastic slash in civilian consumption, most easily effected by freezing wages as prices continue to mount.

The dilemma of the government and the employers is expressed by an editorial in the N. Y. World-Telegram, which complains that "everybody can't escalate." The advantage of the escalator clause to workers, it admits, are "obvious and great" as "a device for maintaining their living standards, no matter how high prices go."

THREAT TO STANDARDS

"But," it goes on, "if the rearmament and mobilization effort means a reduced supply of civilian goods and services . . . everybody's living standards cannot be maintained."

Truman might not be concerned about the escalator clause if he really believed his program could control prices. But that's the rub. He knows he can't control prices and everyone else knows it too. He can get some of the auto

corporations to roll back their latest price increases on passenger cars, because the auto moguls don't expect to be doing much auto production in the future. They are counting on government "cost-plus" contracts for tanks and other war equipment to keep them in the gravy.

But meat prices, which more immediately and directly affect the low-income earners, are another matter. The meat packers have virtually threatened to impose another meat famine, as they did in 1946, if the government puts ceilings on their prices. So Truman isn't talking so tough to them.

EFFECTIVE ACTION

The most effective action American labor can take right now to offset a wage freeze, for which the auto order sets the precedent, is to fight for escalator clauses in every union contract. Let's see if Truman really means business about price controls. A real test would be 16 million organized workers under escalator clause protection.

Under no circumstances, however, should American workers accept a wage-freeze precedent in any form.

THE MILITANT

UAW Executive Board Attempts To Suppress Flint Local Paper

War Mobilizers



Truman's new war economy "czar," Charles E. Wilson of General Electric Co. confers with Secretary of Defense George C. Marshall, former Army Chief of Staff. Wilson, former president of one of the country's largest anti-labor corporations, represents the kind of Big Business executives Truman has placed in command of all the government war agencies and boards.

RAIL WORKERS WIN FEW GAINS IN SETTLEMENT

Officers of four operating unions of the Railroad Brotherhoods reached an agreement Dec. 21 covering over 300,000 workers. The contract, which includes an escalator clause, is still to be ratified by the members. If ratified, the agreement will end a 22-month dispute between the four unions and the railroad companies.

While the workers did not get anywhere near the justifiable demands originally made, the unauthorized strike of yardmen wrung some concessions from the companies and government mediators.

The biggest gain is the inclusion of an escalator clause. This would provide a one cent hourly wage increase for every 1% rise in living costs, on a quarterly basis. This must still be approved by the Wage Stabilization Board, which has not yet made clear what its position will be on such sliding scale contracts.

One of the biggest issues provoking the walkout of 10,000 yardmen was the demand for a 40-hour week. The new proposed agreement agrees to this "in principle" but postpones its application until Jan. 1, 1952, at which time it may or may not be put into practice "depending upon the manpower situation." Under present war conditions this means continuation of the 48 hour week indefinitely.

A wage increase of 25 cents an hour was proposed for 120,000 yardmen, 23 cents retroactive to Oct. 1, 1950, and 2 cents to be effective Jan. 1, 1950. This is 2 cents more than the yardmen were offered prior to their walkout.

The 180,000 road service work-

By Emmett Moore

FLINT, MICH., Dec. 21 — After a year of rumored threats against the *Searchlight*, official newspaper of Chevrolet Local 659 UAW-CIO, the International Executive Board ordered officers of the local to appear before them. The board's telegram to the officers demanded that they "show cause why the policies and stories carried in the *Searchlight* publication of 659 are not in violation of the policies of the International Union. . . ."

The bristling edict of the top officers represents another move in their attempt to destroy the remaining democratic rights of local unions to publish papers critical of the program and actions of the officialdom. This new move marks the hostility of the labor leaders against any forum from which the union ranks can protest against lowered living standards brought on by the immense war preparations.

MEMBERS AROUSED

This encroachment on the rights of local unions has aroused the Chevrolet workers to a fever pitch. Local union officers accomplished this by the simple act of placing the telegram on the front page of the *Searchlight*. It was the only article that appeared. The rest of the blank page graphically illustrated to all members how top union censorship would eliminate the voice of Chevrolet workers from the pages of the *Searchlight*.

The program of the top officers was indicated by their hostile attitude towards the Chevrolet delegation that appeared before them in Detroit. The Chevrolet delegation of six led by local 659 president Coburn Walker started the board by reading a brief statement. "We deny that the policies and stories carried in the *Searchlight* are in violation of the International Union. . . . In justice we believe you should submit specific instances of violations. . . . We request sufficient time to prepare a full and comprehensive statement covering the subjects."

Ignoring this modest request, Livingston, vice-president of the UAW, speaking for the board, proceeded to attack the local for the publication of articles, cartoons, headlines and stories that were critical of Reuther administration policies.

The thin-skinned bureaucrats objected to a headline entitled "Unionism Versus Bugasm" (a reference to the anemic Ford pension settlement). They violently reacted against the protest of Chevrolet workers against any further increase in dues.

The board was furious when the committee refused to answer

any questions until they were put in writing.

DEMAND CENSOR

Upon the return of the local officers to Flint they received a letter from the board ordering them to print their statement in ten point type on the front page of the *Searchlight*. The letter instructs the officers to censor the paper of any critical views of the members against the union leadership.

How convenient it is for the porkchoppers to forget that they fought for complete control by a persistent, stubbornly critical attitude to the Thomas-Addes administration. Or what is more likely this is exactly what they do remember and fear that the militants in the auto union may dispose of them as Reuther did the previous administration.

The UAW officers refuse to acknowledge that the militants by exercising their rights forced the administration to adopt three of the major demands which mobilized the union since 1945. These were the fight for the 30 cent wage increase in 1945, the escalator clause that was won in 1948, and the pension program.

It is clear that Reuther wishes to extend his control over the union at the coming convention. He will undoubtedly press for constitutional controls over local publications. This is a logical extension of the last convention's actions where changes were made in the constitution to provide Reuther with the means of removing militants from posts in local unions.

CLEAR-CUT FIGHT

In order for Chevrolet workers to withstand the assault of the bureaucracy they must realize that Reuther's attack is aimed at all locals with publications critical of the leadership. Chevrolet will have to put them on their guard. It will have to organize a militant opposition to defend their democratic rights. But they must realize that to obtain the greatest support possible it can best be done by a clear-cut fight for the rights of all auto workers. This includes the right of militants to hold office; the right of militant workers to work in the plants, and of course free speech, democratic union elections, and freedom to criticize. A struggle of this type will end the hypocrisy of Reuther's charge of "violation of CIO policy."

Anti-Negro Violence Flares In Alabama Home Bombing

By J. Blake

The battle for democracy for Negroes in the United States received a new setback on the Birmingham, Ala., front last week. Mrs. Mary Leans Monk, who has led the struggle against the city's residential segregation ordinance, won a legal decision declaring the zoning law unconstitutional, but barely escaped death for herself and her family a few days later when her home was dynamited by local white supremacists.

The explosive, thrust through a screen to a porch just outside her bedroom, tore away half a bedroom wall, wrecked the living room, and damaged other rooms in the brick building. One child was struck by falling plaster, but the five other occupants of the house, including Mrs. Monk, reportedly escaped injury.

Little protection from future attacks was expected from local authorities despite their routine posting of a six-man guard around the house after the event, since this is the fifth bombing of a Negro home in the area in the past few years and not a single arrest has been made in connection with any of them.

Moreover, the typical police attitude of blame for the victims rather than the criminals was expressed by Detective G. L. Patty, who "investigated" the dynamiting.

"The decision must have been what she was waiting for," said the minion of the law, "because she moved right in."

COURT RULING

He referred to the Dec. 20 decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals

in an appeal by the city of Birmingham from a District Court judgment in favor of Mrs. Monk and other Negro citizens against the discriminatory zoning ordinance adopted by the City Commission last year.

A wave of bombings of newly-purchased homes was used by the Commission as an excuse for passing the segregation ordinance although such ordinances were declared unconstitutional by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1917 in the case of Buchanan vs. Warley.

The recent Circuit Court decision in favor of Mrs. Monk was handed down with a dissenting opinion by Judge Robert Russell which gave the green light to those who wish to rule with force and violence.

Russell wrote that the city's attorneys should have been permitted to show that "breaches of the peace, riots, destruction of property and life would follow attempts to violate the restrictions."

The dynamiting of Mrs. Monk's home followed by less than 36 hours, demonstrating again the hollowness of American democracy, the folly of depending on court action alone to win equal rights for Negroes, and the necessity for workers' defense guards to protect minority groups against violence condoned (when not instigated) by local officials.

Deadline for Militant

The deadline for articles and ads for *The Militant* is the Tuesday before the date of publication.