

Cost of Living At Record Peak; Will Go Higher

By Cy Thomas

Bounding prices and rent increases have sent the cost of living soaring to a new record peak. According to the latest figures released by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the consumers price index rose from 186.6 on Sept. 15 to 187.4 on Oct. 15. The latter figure is the highest in history, but will go higher under the government's soak-the-poor price control and wage stabilization program.

Michael V. DiSalle, Director of the Office of Price Stabilization, said his agency would soon issue a regulation, "to allow all manufacturers and processors to pass along to consumers cost increases since the start of the Korean war." Testifying before the House-Senate Committee on controls, DiSalle said such an order is made mandatory under the Capehart Amendment to the Defense Production Act.

HAVING FIELD DAY

The price gougers are having a field day at the expense of the consumers. They are not only raking in fabulous profits but, said DiSalle, they are evading the payment of taxes by "passing a big slice of the tax on to consumers in the form of higher prices for their goods."

The 700,000-man AFL Machin-

ists Union sounded the alarm in a front page story in its weekly newspaper which said the whole stabilization program is "tottering." The Office of Price Stabilization, it asserted, is "virtually powerless to prevent another round of price inflation that is now beginning."

REAL WAGES DROP

Although its price control program is a shambles the Truman administration is bent on "holding-the-line" on wages. The widening gap between rising prices and frozen wages has already resulted in a sharp decline in the workers' standard of living. A survey made by the United Nations Department of Economic Affairs reports that in the U.S., "real hourly wages after taxes will fall by about 8 percent in 1951." This conservative estimate is based on official government figures which are notoriously rigged against the workers.

FARCE AND FRAUD

"The stabilization program," says the CIO News, Nov. 19, "is a farce and a fraud." Placing sole responsibility on the "Dixie Congress," as it is the custom among the labor leaders, the News asserts, "there isn't any real price control system in this country today. There are plenty of rules and regulations over wages, and swatting increases in taxes on the average guy — but on price controls, or real rent controls, nothing."

All roads lead to Washington. It is there that the vital questions of prices and wages are decided. With the Democrats and Republicans in control the decision inevitably is against the workers. What to do about it? — that's the big question.

CIO LECTURES WORKERS

"It's easy enough to gripe," lectures the CIO News, "about the high cost of living that's going way up yonder. But the question is: When are we going to turn our gripes into effective political action? When are we going to organize to elect a Congress responsive to the people's will? To be sure, griping is no solution — but why lecture the workers? They can only echo the question: When, pray when, will you provide the leadership, program and organization for an effective political struggle?"

GOOD FOR NOTHING

The answer given by CIO News is "organize for PAC." And the policy of PAC, of course, is to elect Democratic and Republican "friends" to Congress. That policy is good for nothing. It has led to an unbroken series of "worst Congresses" in history.

If the labor leaders are serious about organizing "effective political action" they will promote the organization of labor's own political party to elect labor's own candidates to public office on labor's own program. No phony "friends" are going to do the job for them!

Massachusetts Adopts Police State Measure

By Manny London

BOSTON, Nov. 20 — In the last hours of its record-long session the Massachusetts Legislature passed one of the most vicious thought control bills ever seen in this country. This legislation passed only three bills of importance in a session lasting four weeks longer than that of the 82nd Congress. These were bills increasing the salaries of legislators, an increase in taxes and the "subversive" law which outlaws the Communist Party.

Among the lawmakers' unfinished business were a graft scandal involving the Attorney General and a pay fraud on a Legislature-created Board on Mental Health.

Living up to Dr. Johnson's definition of patriotism as "the last refuge of scoundrels," the legislators tried to cover up the graft scandals, their self-voted salary raise and general inaction on pressing problems by an orgy of flag-waving culminating in the adoption of the repressive gag law.

SAVAGE PENALTIES

Under the provisions of this new law — which has already been signed by Governor Dever — not only is the Communist Party banned but machinery has been set up to declare other organizations "subversive." Many of the provisions are patterned on the

lines of the McCarran Act. The machinery of the law is to be set in motion when the Attorney General of Massachusetts asks the Superior Court for hearings to declare an accused organization "subversive." Upon the court's finding that the accused organization falls within the political ban established in the new law, that organization is dissolved and its funds taken over by the State.

Membership in a "subversive" organization is punishable by fines up to \$1,000 and imprisonment for two years. Concealing records, membership lists, etc., of groups deemed subversive would be punished by fines up to \$5,000 and imprisonment for three years. It is also forbidden under this law to rent halls, etc., to "subversive" organizations or to make donations to them.

When this legislation was proposed the Boston branch of the Socialist Workers Party vigorously opposed it. On two separate occasions representatives of the SWP appeared before legislative committees, denounced the proposals as police state measures and pointed out the dangers to the entire labor movement. Ostensibly passed to outlaw the Communist Party the law is so worded that any organization that is unpopular could be declared illegal in Mas-

sachusetts. This law concentrates great political powers in the hands of the Attorney General. It is noteworthy that at present the Attorney General is the center of a corruption scandal wherein it is charged he personally accepted bribe money.

The explanation for the ease with which this ultra-reactionary law was passed lies in the attitude of organized labor in the state. Some organizations, including the SWP, the American Civil Liberties Union and the League of Women Voters protested the bill. But organized labor did not send a single speaker at any time to the legislative hearings to go on record against the vicious proposals.

In Massachusetts the labor bureaucrats boast of their influence in the corrupt Democratic Party which runs the state. Nonetheless, the labor bureaucracy did not lift a finger to stop the bill and even refused to commit itself. The National CIO has strongly denounced the McCarran Act. The Massachusetts CIO, however, permits a McCarran Act on a state basis to be passed without even raising its voice in opposition. This inaction follows the pattern of the past few years here where the labor leaders have turned a deaf ear to appeals for aid in civil liberties cases.

(See editorial on page 3.)

THE MILITANT

PUBLISHED WEEKLY IN THE INTERESTS OF THE WORKING PEOPLE

Vol. XV - No. 49

NEW YORK, N. Y., MONDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1951

PRICE: FIVE CENTS

Where to Tighten the Belt



Steel Negotiations Start; Wage Freeze Big Issue

By Fred Hart

Contract negotiations between the United Steelworkers of America (CIO) and the United States Steel Co., which opened in Pittsburgh on Nov. 27, has been made the spearhead for the drive of the labor movement to break through the wage-freeze formula of the Wage Stabilization Board. However, the fact that the union side of the negotiations is in the hands of CIO negotiators who have become ensnared in the government "stabilization" machinery makes the outcome very doubtful.

FOR VIGOROUS FIGHT

Worker sentiment for smashing the formula which is now used to freeze wages has become stronger than ever throughout the country in recent months, and has manifested itself in local strikes and stoppages and pressure on the union leaders for a vigorous fight.

The constantly rising cost of living together with the big tax increases, which are in effect pay cuts, is the basic cause of the dissatisfaction of the workers in steel and other industries, and this resentment is rising as the cost of living soars to record heights.

The Steelworkers Union has opened negotiations with demands for a "substantial" wage increase, which, together with other fringe demands would amount to somewhere between 20 and 25 cents an

hour. The Wage Stabilization Board formula would restrict the steelworkers to a far smaller figure.

Steelworkers officials have been strong in their denunciation of the formula in recent months, as preparations for the negotiations were under way. Joseph P. Molony, District Director of the steel union for the Buffalo area, in a speech to a western New York regional Steelworkers conference just before negotiations opened, had this to say:

"I always thought that a formula was something you fed to babies, and evidently the Wage Stabilization Board thinks they

are doing business with babies. But, by the end of next month, they will find that they are doing business with the hairiest bunch of babies they ever tried to bottle feed."

This kind of talk was very popular with the representatives of the steel locals that gathered to hear Mr. Molony speak. Whether the negotiating committee of the union will carry that attitude into the conferences with the arrogant steel barons, and even more important, whether they will stick to that stand when the power of Wall Street's government is thrown against them, as it will be, remains to be seen.

Opposition to Treaty Grows, Tokyo Correspondent Says

By A Special Correspondent

TOKYO — The ratification by the Japanese Diet of the Peace Treaty and the Security Pact has provoked an angry opposition that threatens to spread from Japan's big industrial centers throughout the whole country.

The Peace Treaty came as a sharp disappointment to the masses, who had been encouraged by the ruling classes to hope it would provide some way out of the present unbearable hardships provoked in part by the American occupation.

The people were also profoundly shocked by the Security Pact with its clause that permits the use of American troops to put down revolts in this country. The word Nairan (civil war), which has been almost a taboo, was openly used in reference to Japan itself in the discussion in the Diet.

The public discussion of such matters has done a great deal to shock the people into realizing the real nature of the treaties.

Anti-war sentiment had been crystallizing among Japanese workers as early as last summer, especially around the movement for the "Four Principles of Peace." These four principles are: Against a separate treaty, for a treaty with all the powers; against joining either bloc, for neutrality; against rearmament; against any foreign military base in the country.

The Tenth Congress of the State Railway Workers Union, one of the strongest in Japan, adopted these principles by a vote of 292 to 113 last June. The vote was especially significant because this union was the stronghold of the so-called Democratic League movement which was created to fight the radicalization of the labor movement by the Stalinists.

Other unions that have adopted the same policy include the Teachers Union, Private Railway Workers, Transport Workers, Electric Industrial Workers, Coal Miners, etc. They thus declared their determination to fight any attempt by the Yoshida government to enslave the Japanese people for the benefit of American imperialism.

These tendencies have had their immediate reflection among the intellectuals. Many leading university professors have been emboldened and are openly criticizing the Peace Treaty and Security Pact; some are now advocating a world peace movement. Dr. Nambu, president of Tokyo University, quite recently denounced the separate peace treaty at his farewell lecture to his students.

The treaties resulted in a serious crisis within the Socialist (Continued on page 3)

GI Discontent Forced Order To Hold Fire

Generals Alarmed by Cease-Fire Action Of Troops, Say Fighting Must Be Resumed

By George Lavan

Interpreting an order from the top command in accordance with their own desires, U.S. troops in Korea brought about a cease-fire virtually along the entire battle-front for as long as 48-hours in some sectors.

The enthusiasm with which the GIs put into effect the cease-fire and the prospect of possible fraternization between the opposing armies so alarmed the top command and leading U.S. diplomatic and political circles that new orders were issued to the troops emphasizing that there was no cease-fire and that the war should go on with U.S. troops "shooting to kill."

LIGHT BONFIRES

Soon after the firing stopped, front-line GIs in some sectors watched Chinese troops playing volley ball in no-man's land. The Chinese and North Korean attitude towards the cessation of hostilities was further shown by their lighting bonfires instead of maintaining the usual blackout at night.

Such developments in the first hours following the "misunderstanding" by the troops that an informal cease-fire existed, undoubtedly led the top brass to fear that discontent among the GIs would increase and that fraternization might soon develop.

HATE CAMPAIGN FLOPS

U.S. newspapers led by the authoritative N. Y. Times recently discussed with dismay the fact that the GIs were being "taken in" by Chinese demands for an immediate cease-fire. This was attributed to the failure of the U.S. Army to "educate" the GIs on the issues and the nature of the enemy. Attempts to indoctrinate the troops against the idea of an immediate cease-fire included atrocity propaganda to incite hatred against the Chinese and Korean troops such as the now discredited story that many thousands of American prisoners were murdered.

It is significant that Col. James H. Hanley, who led off with the first set of alleged atrocity figures, said that he had

issued his report "to let soldiers at the front know the nature of their enemy." Atrocity stories emanating from the Big Brass were, however, unable to stop the mounting dissatisfaction of the combat troops with the U.S. truce negotiators and the feeling that this "useless" war without perspective should end.

When the truce negotiators agreed on the line of opposing armies the Chinese proposed that a cease-fire go into effect then and there. U.S. negotiators rejected the proposition. Troop indignation as well as public opinion in the U.S. and the distrust on the part of U.S. allies led to a compromise agreement at Panmunjom. This provided that the agreed on line would be valid for thirty days. During these thirty days war was to continue, and if the remaining points in dispute had not been agreed upon by the end of the thirty day period a new line corresponding to the new positions of the two armies would be drawn.

VETO BY TROOPS

The troops vetoed this strategy of the top command. Twenty-four

707 More

U.S. battle casualties in Korea are up to 100,883. This is an increase of 707 over the preceding week.

The more than 100,000 reported casualties include 17,153 dead in Truman's "police action." 71,307 Americans have been wounded in the Korea fighting, and another 10,856 are reported "missing in action."

The Defense Department casualty figures do not include so-called "non-battle" casualties, such as accidental injuries, and a very large number of serious frostbite cases, some of them amputations.

Gen. Ridgway proposes to continue the senseless slaughter until a "full" armistice. The GIs want an end to the war! Bring them home now!

hours before news of the end of firing in Korea reached the U.S., newspapers were carrying stories by United Press war correspondent Robert Vermillion, headed: "Stop Firing NOW, GIs At Front Demand" (N. Y. Post, Nov. 27). Vermillion summarized GI feeling thus: "American front-line troops feel that the shooting in Korea should halt immediately or subside by unspoken agreement while the truce talks continue."

TYPICAL STATEMENTS

Among the typical statements of the GIs quoted by Vermillion was the following from a sergeant: "We want to get the hell out of Korea but we don't expect any armistice to do it. But if they're going to stop the shooting they should do it right now, while I'm still alive." A private asked the reporter: "Thirty more days? What for? If they don't want to sign anything over there in Panmunjom why not just let the shooting fade away until we decide what we're going to do — we'll all go for that. You know, let the shooting fade away and us old soldiers will never die."

This is exactly how the front-line troops interpreted the still secret order from General James A. Van Fleet, Commander of the 8th Army. They "just let the shooting fade away."

Despite the new orders to resume fighting it is apparent that, given the overwhelming feeling of the troops for an end to hostilities, United States commanders would have to think twice before ordering the reluctant GIs into major offensive operations. The GIs are thinking things out for themselves and object to being used as just so much cannon fodder by the Big Brass. Every GI, every member of an airplane crew wants to live and wants to return home. They hope that the bloody war in Korea will soon end and they believe that every further death in battle is a needless, tragic sacrifice. They are right. All Americans with the interests of the GIs at heart should demand the immediate end of the war in Korea and the withdrawal of all U.S. troops.

'Liberation Battalion' Movement Spreads Through Egypt's Cities

By John G. Wright

Egypt is in a revolutionary crisis. It was precipitated when the British, with the full backing of the American imperialists, forcibly seized the Suez Canal area. The first phase of this revolutionary crisis has been marked by a series of anti-imperialist demonstrations which saw millions pouring out into the streets of Alexandria and Cairo while other millions demonstrated from one end of the country to the other.

Almost simultaneously with these extraordinary mass outpourings came the organization of "Liberation Battalions." The rise of these revolutionary bodies appears to have been spontaneous. The Cairo correspondent of the N. Y. Times cabled on Nov. 17 that this Liberation Battalion movement "just sprang up." Apparently it has no central leadership as yet.

LIBERATION BATTALIONS

"It is not a highly organized movement with a definite leadership," states the same correspondent who then adds: "Some

had arm bands; some, notably in Sharkia Province, obtained some arms."

These Battalions, armed and unarmed alike, immediately began to assume and exercise authority in their own name. In their localities these Battalions "undertook to do a certain amount of policing on their own." Other groups "representing no one knows exactly whom began to assume authority."

The profoundly revolutionary implications of such a development are self-evident. A new power, resting on popular masses and independent of the existing government is beginning to exercise authority on its own initiative. The Egyptian government is naturally anxious to head off this movement. It has attempted to achieve this by an official announcement that it would "take over leadership and training of the Liberation Battalions."

It still remains to be seen to what extent the Egyptian authorities will be able to exercise more than a nominal control over these revolutionary formations.

Highly symptomatic is the public role being played by Egyptian women who participated both in the mass demonstrations and in the Liberation Battalions. On Nov. 23, the Associated Press carried on its wires a photograph showing three Egyptian women, armed with rifles, engaging in guerrilla training at Cairo. The position of women in Egypt, as throughout the Mohammedan world, is a degraded one. That women appear publicly, without veils, let alone guns in hand, is a tell-tale sign of how deeply the revolutionary ferment has already penetrated.

At present the Liberation Battalion movement appears to be concentrated in cities and towns. Egypt is the most industrialized country in the Near East and the Egyptian workers are destined to play the major role in the events. The Times correspondent reports that the outlawed Communist organization is split up "into four or five quarrelling sects. Trotskyism is one thing that seems to have considerable hold on Egyptian Communists." (There is as yet no confirmation of this report

of the prominent role of Egyptian Trotskyists among the class-conscious workers.)

The events in Egypt are unfolding against the background of perhaps the worst poverty and exploitation in the world. According to official figures the average income of Egyptian peasants is \$40 a year, or less than 80 cents a week. A daily wage of 20 cents for workers is considered high. Child laborers, of whom there are many, receive 20 cents a week.

The Egyptian masses correctly hold the Western imperialists primarily responsible for these inhuman conditions. "The idea is almost universal," admits the Times dispatch, "that imperialism, colonialism and foreign predominance must somehow be responsible for the frustrating poverty and helplessness that are found in the world of the Arab and Persian." This universal recognition in Egypt, as throughout the Middle East, of the unpostponable need to get rid of the imperialists has invested the unfolding struggle from the very outset with tremendous scope and power.

Notebook of an Agitator

SOME CHICKENS COME HOME TO ROOST!

In the heyday of the Communist Party in this country, when they were the most frenzied of all the patriots, supporting the no-strike pledge in World War II and receiving governmental favor in return, the number of Stalinist-controlled unions and central labor bodies of the CIO reached an imposing figure.

They controlled the CIO Industrial Union Council of New York City, for example, and manipulated it at will in support of the current slogans of the party. The executive bodies of such powerful organizations as the National Maritime Union and the United Electrical Workers were in their hands, along with a dozen or more other important unions. "Local 65," the big organization of Wholesale and Retail Workers in New York, was tightly controlled by the CP and operated like a dairy full of milk cows for the benefit and sustenance of the Communist Party and its various enterprises.

Appearance of Strength

With this line-up the Stalinists appeared to have a position of great strength in the trade union movement which would be very hard to break. The appearance, however, was somewhat illusory, as subsequent developments, following the break-up of the American-Soviet war alliance and the beginning of the "cold war," soon revealed.

The methods of unscrupulous demagoguery, bureaucratic manipulation and deals with careerists, by which the Stalinists had gained control of the unions and central labor bodies from the top, were the very same methods employed by Murray and Co. to "decontrol" them, and proved even more efficacious. The Stalinists in most instances lacked the "secret weapon" of support by an ardent and educated rank and file. The dizzying speed with which they were unhorsed in one union and industrial union council after another, when the government which they had supported so enthusiastically during the war turned against them, was one of the amazing wonders of recent labor history.

Years ago the Communist Party embarked on its course of expelling revolutionary militants, who can't be had at a price, and turning toward opportunists and careerists whose single principle is self-interest. For a time, in a favorable conjuncture, this method of operation brought quick, if deceptive, results. As long as things went well, with the government and even some of the biggest employers taking an attitude of benevolence or neutrality toward the Stalinists, their manipulations and deals with trade union careerists at the top and their brutal bureaucratic suppression of the ranks at the bottom paid off like a slot machine rigged to beat the sucker.

Change Came Overnight

This policy can work miracles in the service of a dominant power, but it is absolutely no good to create a new and independent power from scratch. That requires the principled politics of the class struggle. Everything changed almost overnight with the change in the international situation, when the power the Stalinists had been serving turned against them. All the clever tricks turned into disastrous fumbles. The top careerists upon whom they relied and ostensibly "controlled" simply weren't there anymore.

Following their noses in the direction of personal interest, as this tribe always does, they promptly swung over to the stronger side and became the most virulent "red-baiters" in the business. Conspicuous examples are Quill and Curran, long regarded, with good reason, as CP labor stooges. But they are only two of scores and hundreds of major and minor functionaries who deserted the Communist Party ship as soon as it sprung a leak.

After the big purge carried out by the Murray leadership, with the open support and even at the instigation of the government, the Stalinists were left with a few "independent" unions, such as the West Coast Longshoremens, Local 65 in

New York, the Fur and Leather Workers, a minority of the United Electrical Workers, and the rump and tag-ends of other unions. When the "shakedown" was apparently completed and a certain new equilibrium established, it was generally assumed that these expelled independent unions which had resisted the purge were Stalinist-controlled, for sure and for good.

That is not necessarily so. For the most part, the top bureaucrats in these unions are substantially no different in character from the others who had switched allegiance under pressure. The only real difference was in the circumstances which made the switch of allegiance easier for some, like Quill and Curran, and more difficult for others.

Curran, for example, was the lucky beneficiary of a split in the CP maritime fraction, which brought him the support of its strongest sector and gave him the necessary elbow room. Quill had only to renounce and denounce the Communist Party in super-patriotic terms to demonstrate that the Stalinists had no real support in the ranks and were absolutely powerless in the showdown. Some of the leaders in other unions were more closely surrounded by strong fractions and could not follow the example of Quill and Curran. Murray made their position all the more difficult by rejecting all compromise and forcing an immediate decision.

Process of Disintegration

However, I suspected from the start that the process of disintegration would continue even in these independent unions. I thought it quite possible that many of the careerist bureaucrats in the expelled unions, having interests of their own to serve, which are not identical with the interests of the Stalinist Party bureaucrats, would eventually follow the example of their former colleagues; only, perforce, at a slower pace and by a more devious route.

This trend was already indicated by the policy of the leaders of the independent UE from the first moment of the split. They left the CIO Convention, where the expulsions were to take place, before the floor fight was finished, leaving the other Stalinist labor skates at the convention in the lurch. Their first concern was to get back into the field and mend their own fences for the coming split. This was the first ominous sign of things to come.

It was further to be noticed that the UE, which had once stood out in front as a political instrument of Stalinism, promoting all the political slogans of the party, changed its tactical line radically. In their organizational struggle against the rival CIO union in the same field, the UE leaders, began to overlook, leave out, and forget many of the political slogans — which were of primary interest to the party bureaucrats — and to concentrate on purely trade union issues — which were of primary interest to them. This was another sign.

The Latest Developments

Further and more definite indication of this trend of some of the independent unions toward independence of the Communist Party, apparently leading to an outright break, is clearly revealed now in the latest developments in the Distributive, Processing and Office Workers Union, formerly known as "Local 65." The bureaucratic chickens of the CP are coming home to roost here too.

In a major shake-up four vice-presidents have been "reorganized" out of their posts. And from the way the Daily Worker is complaining about it, one must definitely conclude that the "reorganization" was not planned that way by the political bureau of the CP.

This red-hot development is what I started out to write about today, but the introduction has already used up my space. An examination of the heads that rolled in the palace revolution in "65" will have to wait till next time.

— J. P. C.

Why They Want a War Against the Soviet Union

By Art Preis

Leading American magazines are engaged in a debate over the cheapest and most reliable way to destroy the Soviet Union. Collier's recently devoted an entire issue to describing the atomic war it would like to see waged against the USSR. The U.S. News and World Report and Saturday Evening Post have urged the financing and arming of counter-revolutions in the Soviet Union and countries allied to it.

We can dismiss the claim that their warlike hostility to the Soviet Union reflects their abhorrence of totalitarianism. They stomach Stalin well enough when it was to the interest of U.S. imperialism to accept him as a "glorious ally" in the Second World War. They find to their taste such fascists and totalitarians as Franco, Chiang Kai-shek, Syngman Rhee, the Vatican, King Paul of Greece, the Japanese militarists and the ex-Nazis.

The undisguised and unrelenting ferocity of these Big Business publications toward the Soviet Union has a class origin. They oppose the economic and social system in the Soviet Union, which was founded by a workers' revolution that nationalized industry and eliminated the capitalist class.

In its Oct. 27 issue on "Russia's Defeat and Occupation — 1952-1960," Collier's discloses the real aim of American imperialism to be the restoration of capitalism in Russia with ownership in the hands of American Big Business. This is proposed by Stuart Chase, writing on the economy of Russia after its defeat in the Collier's imaginary atomic war.

Chase concludes that "our first tentative principle for the future Russian economy — and it has world-wide application — is to limit economic planning to essential functions . . . conservation, public health, education, the

allocation of radio waves and the like, but allow private enterprises and private groups to make as many decisions as are functionally possible."

But how about the ownership of the means of production, distribution and natural resources? Chase answers by an attack on nationalizations, including a blast at the nationalization of Iran's oil industry and of the British steel industry. But where will the capitalist class come from to take over private ownership of Russian industry? Chase says that until a "class of enterprisers can be trained," a provisional government would run industry until "plants could be sold to private industry — as in Puerto Rico." But "some operations, however, could be leased or sold to foreign business men immediately." In short, Wall Street would take over.

The U.S. News of Nov. 2, which disputes Collier's thesis of sole reliance on atomic warfare "which would blow up much of the world, if started," reveals concern about the instability of U.S. economy as compared to that of the Soviet Union and its allies, poor and undeveloped as they are.

"If the U.S.-style war is not fought, there is the prospect of economic disaster when preparations for that imaginary war slows. Communists plan to be around to pick up pieces. Either way it goes, so far as anyone can learn from this country's planners, the end product of American planning is something like chaos."

The "catch," according to U.S. News, is "that Communist strategists . . . are in position to call reverse signals if danger of war really seems to threaten. . . . One bright morning they can be all sweetness and light, smiling, talking business, making concessions, agreeing to arms cuts. Inflated by vast armaments effort, the bubble in U.S. could burst. . . ."

CIO Leaders "Reason" with Capitalists to Ban Jim Crow

By Albert Parker

The unions must take the lead in fighting racial discrimination and segregation because Jim Crow divides the workers, weakens the unions, makes it harder to organize the unorganized and benefits the employers generally.

That was how, in the early days of the CIO, its leaders used to explain the need for anti-Jim Crow policies and legislation. It was a good approach. It was addressed to the workers themselves, it showed them how their living standards were affected, and it taught them something about the cause of Jim Crow.

But in recent years, especially since the beginning of the cold war, the CIO leaders have been taking a different line, although they continue to advocate progressive anti-discrimination measures. Here is how they discuss it today:

"The practice of discrimination . . . is the weakest spot in our national armor." (Report to CIO convention by CIO Committee to Abolish Discrimination.)

"I know of no situation in the United States that has thrust our country into more real embarrassing positions in our nation's relationships with other countries throughout the world than has this question of civil rights at home. . . . I know how the leaders of our great nation are embarrassed when they enter the councils of the United Nations and have read on page one of the morning newspaper some act of discrimination that has been perpetrated against an individual because of his color. It does not lend comfort to the situation which we occupy in the United Nations." (Philip Murray)

"There is a revolution going on in the world involving hundreds of millions of peoples. They want the same things we want, economic opportunity, a chance to eat and live better, a measure of human dignity. If we could stand before the world with clean hands, we could give a moral leadership to the world that would be worth 100 military divisions." (Walter Reuther)

The CIO leaders think this new approach, which is addressed primarily to the government and the employers, is a "shrewd" way of combating discrimination. They couldn't be wronger.

The capitalists don't need anyone to tell them that Jim Crow is an "embarrassment" to their fraudulent claims about being the champions of democracy. They know it as well as Murray and Reuther, but they maintain Jim Crow in all its essentials just the same. Murray and Reuther do not think of asking themselves why

What U.S. News here concedes is that the Soviet Union does not need war, that it has no internal compulsion to war, but that it is the economy of the U.S. which would be in difficulty with any let-up of the war economy. Either war or a let-up of the war economy would be disastrous, laments U.S. News, and it finally offers as the only alternative the stimulation of "revolts" inside the Soviet Union and its satellites.

U.S. News is not the only publication toying with this idea of "revolts" in the Soviet Union — by which is meant an overthrow of its non-capitalist property forms. Maj. Gen. J. P. C. Fuller, a British military authority writing in the Oct. 27 Saturday Evening Post, calls for a "war of disintegration within the USSR and its satellite countries . . . its aim — successful counter-revolution within the USSR . . . the complete elimination of Bolshevism . . . the Soviet Empire must be dealt with as was the Turkish — that is, split up into its component parts. . . ."

Such counter-revolution — that is, the restoration of capitalism — will not come about by any action of the masses in Russia, however. A very significant article has appeared in the Nov. 25 New York Times Magazine revealing the findings of the Harvard University Russian Research Center, based on questioning of thousands of emigres and refugees from the Soviet Union. While there is a tremendous hatred of the Stalinist regime, according to this survey, "on the economic level, they (the Russian people) would have the Government own and control heavy industry, railroads, all means of communication and all natural resources. Despite their experiences with the Soviet system they feel that under ideal conditions a planned economy would be better than an unplanned one. . . ."

"As for government ownership of industry, the feeling is both that this is a more efficient and desirable arrangement and also that the people of the USSR have constructed this new industrial system with their own sweat and therefore should retain ownership. . . . It is additionally significant that though these attitudes toward collectivism and paternalism are held uniformly by a majority from all social groups, they tended to be most strongly held by the poorest and least educated people, whose rejection of the regime is usually most categorical and undifferentiated. . . ."

American imperialism can expect no support from the Russian masses, even oppressed as they are by Stalinism, for restoring capitalism in Russia. The conclusion of the Harvard survey is that American Big Business can rely only on "application of force from the outside" to overthrow the Soviet Union. This counter-revolutionary force will meet with ferocious resistance from the people of Russia who understand that the elimination of Stalinism is their problem alone, and that U.S. intervention is designed not to bring them political freedom, but enslavement under capitalism.

Minneapolis SWP Forum Topic Is "Road to Peace"

By Winifred Nelson

MINNEAPOLIS, Nov. 23 — "Socialism is the road to peace, because only socialism, deals with the causes of war. That is the road of Lenin. There is no other road to peace."

With these words, Dorothy Schultz concluded her talk here tonight on "The Road to Peace." Students and workers who had come to the Socialist Workers Party hall to hear the speech expressed agreement with the SWP program during the question period.

"The policy advocated by the military branches of the government — that of peace through strength — does not bring peace — rather, it leads to war," Comrade Schultz declared. In the past few years, she added, three-fourths of the national budget has gone for wars, past, present and future.

The audience contributed generously to a collection to promote the program of the SWP, and remained to discuss with the speaker over cake and coffee. A number of copies of James P. Cannon's pamphlet, "The Road to Peace" were sold, as well as the Militant.

Next in the current series of Friday night talks will be "The Sun Sets on the British Empire" on December 7. Grace Carlson will speak.

Five Branches On Schedule In SWP Fund Drive

By Reba Aubrey
Fund Campaign Manager

Twelve branches of the Socialist Workers Party sent in payments last week totaling \$703 on the \$18,000 Organization and Press Fund. Through Nov. 26 the scoreboard shows \$5,198 collected 28% of the national quota. At the end of the sixth week of our 13-week campaign we are lagging 18% behind schedule.

Only five branches are on or ahead of schedule. Newark tops the scoreboard with 74% of its \$500 quota, followed by Pittsburgh with 60%. Chicago holds third place with 55%, Akron fourth with 53%, and St. Louis jumped from ninth to fifth place by fulfilling 50% of its quota.

These are the on-schedule branches, but some of the others are fighting their way up the scoreboard. Comrade Genora sent an \$18 payment on Flint's quota, saying: "The last two weeks have been tough financially on our comrades so we are a little behind schedule. BUT DON'T WORRY about the Flint branch. Of the \$152 collected and sent in, \$39 has been contributed by sympathizers — not a bad ratio." G. Holley, treasurer of Milwaukee branch, sent in \$9 and explained: "Returns have been a little slow here lately, but we hope they will pick up soon."

Another payment of \$10 from Comrade Pearl boosted Connecticut to 40%.

Buffalo pushed from 19 to 33% with two payments totaling \$137. M. Baker sent \$164 on Detroit's campaign quota. She says: "That 'picking up speed' I mentioned is somewhat relative! However, we're doing all we can to hasten the process, and you know we always chug in on time at the end."

Lil Charles, Fund Director for Los Angeles, mailed in \$128 and explains: "We have been hit by growing families and, far more serious, the sharply increased cost of living. We still reaffirm our determination to complete our quota, for we understand the need full well."

The Cleveland comrades doubled their score to 24% with a \$40 payment.

Sally Conti sent this note with a \$25 payment for the Boston branch: "Payments are slow, but I'm confident that we'll reach our goal."

San Francisco branch pushed ahead a few points with a \$30 payment on its \$1,000 quota.

\$18,000 FUND SCOREBOARD

Branch	Quota	Paid	Percent
Newark	\$ 500	\$ 372	74
Pittsburgh	50	30	60
Chicago	1,000	545	55
Akron	150	80	53
St. Louis	100	50	50
St. Paul-Minneapolis	1,000	444	44
Flint	350	152	43
Milwaukee	250	107	43
Connecticut	75	30	40
Youngstown	350	120	34
Buffalo	1,000	327	33
Detroit	1,500	488	33
Los Angeles	2,600	738	28
Philadelphia	400	99	25
Cleveland	300	72	24
Boston	550	122	22
New York	5,000	1,055	21
Seattle	400	82	21
Toledo	50	10	20
San Francisco	1,000	75	8
Allentown	75	0	0
Oakland	150	0	0
General	1,150	200	17
Total through Nov. 26	\$18,000	\$5,198	28

THE MILITANT ARMY

Good results are reported by branches getting an early start on their renewals of Militant campaign subscriptions. Milwaukee sent in 11 subs last month, while the first visits in Boston and Minneapolis netted these branches four renewals each. Boston and New York plan all-out visiting of subscribers this Sunday. Literature Agent Jean Simon sent in five subs for Cleveland this week and Flint added another six to their score, bringing their total renewals to date up to 40 subscriptions.

Flint Literature Agent Fred Perry writes, "The big blizzard slowed us down last week, but we hope to come back strong this week and by the end of next week we hope to have completed our list." Flint plans another short campaign in January to catch the last of their sub renewals and in April, Fred writes, they will have another full-scale drive for new subscriptions.

Bea Allen, Detroit Literature Agent, writes to increase their bundle and to report very good sales at union meetings last week. "We went to a meeting of Ford workers," she writes, "and sold 82 copies of The Militant and 18 copies of the 'Negro Struggle' pamphlet. The scores are as follows: J. K. sold 12 Militants; Howie, 13 and a 20c. contribution; Cyn, 22 copies and two pamphlets, plus a five cents donation; and J. H., 15 copies and 14 pamphlets.

"Since we were competing with the Stalinists and their paper, and with other groups who were selling and passing out free literature, we were very elated with our results. We also sold at a few other meetings during the week. At a DeSoto meeting of about 20, Eddie sold eight Militants, and at another meeting of 10 people, George and Alice sold two papers. They had covered a meeting earlier at which they sold six copies and got a 15 cent contribution."

Akron Literature Agent Katherine Cooper sold 21 Militants at two meetings last week. At an NAACP meeting of about 20 people she sold five copies of the issue reporting the National Negro Labor Conference. A few nights later she sold 16 at the Jewish Center Hall where Walter Reuther was lecturing.

Chicago Literature Agent Bert Deck reports a very successful sale at a protest meeting on the Cicero case. He writes, "We sold 69 copies of The Militant, 10 copies of The Struggle for Negro Equality, and 10 copies of 'The Road to Peace.' We took only 10 with us as an experiment and could have sold a lot more. This is the question that people are most interested in today. Esther, Marj, Hayden, Iref, Pat, Manny, Frank and Jacky were the comrades who sold today."

HELP WANTED
Your contributions are needed for a
BAZAAR
Dec. 15, 1951
Given by
Socialist Workers Party
734 So. Wabash, Chicago, Ill.
Call HA 7-0403 for our pick-up service
Thank you

TWIN CITIES Public Meeting

Subject:
"The Sun Sets on the British Empire"
Speaker:
Grace Carlson
Time: 8 PM Friday, Dec. 7
Place: 10 So. Fourth Street
Minneapolis, Minn.
ADMISSION FREE
Auspices:
Socialist Workers Party

THE BEST Christmas Gift:
A One-Year subscription to The Militant
ONLY \$2

Letters from Readers

Spurned Filipino Given Burial

Editor: Here in Los Angeles, a Filipino, Mike Valerio, a former cook who died a few days ago was taken to the Valhalla cemetery in Burbank, but was refused burial because of his race. As a result his friends had to shop around before they discovered the Evergreen cemetery in East Los Angeles which accepted his remains.

When a similar case of a Winnebago Indian from Nebraska,

who was refused burial in Sioux City, Iowa, attracted nation wide attention, President Truman tried to make it appear as though this was an unusual occurrence, and arranged for a plot in Arlington National Cemetery. The case of Sgt. John R. Rice was doubly embarrassing because he was killed in Korea fighting for "democracy"; but the case in Los Angeles belies any claim that racial restrictions do not follow us to the grave. In fact, could anyone conceive of a Negro in the South being buried in a white cemetery?

When Mr. Truman denounced the Rice affair, and let the Indian veteran be buried in Arlington cemetery, he figured that would prove that he had a policy of non-discrimination. However, it will take more than some headline making incidents to prove Mr. Truman's sincerity. During his inaugural parade in Washington, at the time that he was reelected, reviewing stands

were temporarily erected along Pennsylvania Avenue. Along with the stands, there were lavatories built for men, women and Negroes. Mr. Truman should wipe discrimination in his own back yard before he makes hypocritical claims about defending democracy.

S. S.
Los Angeles

American Workers Can Stop A-Bombing

Editor: My friends asked me to write to you and express their appreciation of the issue of the Militant containing the article on Collier's war issue. Several people told me they were just waiting to see the Militant after seeing Collier's. They knew the Militant is too good a paper to pass by such an outrage in silence.

They say that's exactly what ought to be done: to rouse the American workers NOW against the planned attack on the Soviet Union, NOW before Russian cities are turned into a blazing hell, populated by the mutilated and dying.

B. M.
Boston

Detroit

Friday Evening Lecture Series on
"The Struggle for Socialism in America"
Starting Dec. 7, 1951
at 7:30 PM
at
SWP Hall
6108 Linwood

THE ROAD TO PEACE

by James P. Cannon

Single Copy 25c 5 Copies \$1.00
(Postage included)

Order from

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

116 University Place New York 3, N. Y.

THE MILITANT

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

Editor: GEORGE BREITMAN Business Manager: JOSEPH HANSEN
Subscription: \$2 per year; \$1 for 6 months. Foreign: \$3.50 per year;
\$2 for 6 months. Single Copies (5 or more copies): 3c each in U.S.,
4c each in foreign countries.
Signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent The Mil-
itant's policies. These are expressed in its editorials.
"Entered as second class matter March 7, 1944 at the Post Office
at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879."
Vol. XV - No. 49 Monday, December 3, 1951

Deceiving the People

Ten years after Pearl Harbor, the American people are being deceived the same way they were in 1941 — they are being dragged down the road to war with deliberately false assurances that it is a road to peace. That is the charge made in the Nov. 24 Saturday Evening Post by associate editor Demaree Bess.

In 1941 the Roosevelt administration pushed through the Lend-Lease Act with the claim that it would keep America out of war. Discussing the striking parallel of present developments with those of 1941, Bess notes:

"Some of those who worked hardest for Lend-Lease and supported it most sincerely have since admitted that they knew Lend-Lease meant all-out war for the United States, although they publicly denied it at the time. These Americans still believe that the public had to be fooled, for its own good, and that the deception they practiced was justified by events."

And the same thing is happening today. "Now, as then, we are providing arms and other help to every country and every group which undertakes to oppose our avowed enemy," Bess continues. "Now, as then, Washington spokesmen express hope that we can destroy the enemy short of all-out war, while some of them show by their actions that they don't believe what they say."

The capitalist politicians in Washington don't believe what they say, and the American people should not believe them either. The issue of war or peace is too vital to be entrusted to the hands of men who expect war, want war and are preparing for war, but who think the public has to be fooled "for its own good." The power to decide this question must be taken out of the hands of the politicians and turned over to the public that suffers the consequences and has to pay the costs of war. Through a national referendum vote on this question, the public itself will be able to decide what is for its own good.

Jim Crow at the Gate

A program pledging to "extend union contracts to the hiring gate" was adopted in Grand Rapids by nearly 500 delegates at a statewide Fair Practices and Civil Rights Conference of CIO United Auto Workers locals in Michigan. This progressive idea was in line with the recent national CIO convention resolution urging each affiliate to "seek to have incorporated in its collective bargaining agreement clauses that will insure non-discrimination in hiring."

President Walter Reuther spoke in favor of the proposal. "Most of our contracts have anti-discrimination clauses in them, and by and large we are able to police our contracts," he said. "But that isn't doing much for the worker who can't get hired because of his race." Reuther exaggerates when he claims that "by and large" the anti-discrimination clauses in union contracts are enforced. Actually, the situation varies from plant to plant, being enforced more or less in some, and ignored in others, not only in the UAW but other unions.

But Reuther spoke the plain truth when he noted that existing clauses are of little or no help to workers who suffer discrimination at the hiring gate. The broadening of union contracts to correct this defect would be a real step forward for the labor movement and would do much to strengthen the unions and promote the labor-Negro alliance that is needed to fight reaction. Like the national CIO convention, the Michigan conference drew up an appeal for Truman to issue an executive order outlawing discriminatory hiring practices in industries receiving government contracts.

The CIO has been asking for such an executive order since the Korean war began. Truman can issue it any time he wants to; in this case he can't use his usual alibi that Congress won't cooperate. How much longer will the CIO leaders continue to politely request it? When will they begin to fight for it? So far, they haven't even made its issuance a condition for their further political support of Truman.

The Word and the Deed

A few weeks ago the Massachusetts CIO leaders attended the national CIO convention in New York and there applauded and unanimously voted for a strong civil liberties resolution condemning the McCarran Act and the Smith Gag Law. By their action the CIO convention recognized that such repressive measures are aimed at the entire labor movement.

But what is voted in New York is very different from what is done in Boston. We refer specifically to the story in this week's Militant from Massachusetts about the passage of legislation to outlaw the Communist Party as well as other left-wing political organizations. This flagrant police-state violation of the Bill of Rights was passed without even a mumbled protest coming from the trade union leadership.

The labor leaders of Massachusetts cannot claim they didn't know about the bill because it received long and loud publicity. Nor can they claim that their organizations have not taken a position on such legislation because the whole labor movement nationally is on record against precisely such laws.

Rather than oppose the professional red-baiters, the reactionary press and the Catholic hierarchy, the Massachusetts CIO leaders acted as if they were unaware of the police-state measure pending in the legislature. They did not even acquaint the legislature with the position of the national CIO on such legislation.

The only excuse the labor bureaucrats can claim is cowardice. And if they want to claim this they shouldn't hypocritically pose as determined defenders of civil liberties at their national conventions.

We won't argue which is the worse quality for a labor leadership — cowardice or hypocrisy. Either one renders them unfit to lead the working people. Together they make the situation a crying disgrace.

Capitalism Means War: A Reply to Norman Thomas

By Thomas Raymond

The New Leader of Nov. 26 carries an article by Norman Thomas on the topic: "Capitalism, Socialism and War." Since the experience of many years has shown that these are the three things about which Norman Thomas is most ignorant, it is ludicrous for the New Leader to bill this article as "a complete revolution in socialist thinking."

The particular aspect of "socialist thinking" which Norman Thomas so boldly revolutionizes is the Marxist conclusion that capitalism breeds war, and that the only way mankind can eliminate war is by reorganizing society on a socialist basis. This is the conception, fully accepted by genuine socialists, which Thomas challenges.

Of course, nothing can be said

against evaluating or re-evaluating any of the conceptions of Marxism in the light of new experiences. Marxism in always open to challenge and ready to accept all challenges, even when they come from one who knows as little about Marxism as Norman Thomas.

However, it is incumbent upon anyone calling himself a "socialist," who challenges some fundamental aspect of Marxism to show a reason, a justification for the sudden rejection of a well established principle. He would have to show some body of experience, some facts that have cast a doubt upon a previously accepted idea, and then proceed from there to re-evaluate the idea.

Thomas wants to re-evaluate the Marxist tenet that capitalism means war. Why? Has the

capitalist world become peaceable? Have we been living in a prolonged period of peace and quiet, with no wars or talk of wars, so that we are impelled to doubt our long-standing conviction? Why should anything that has happened during the past years, or anything that is happening at the present time, raise any doubt on this matter in the mind of any socialist?

Simply to ask these questions is to answer them. Of course capitalism has not stopped breeding wars, but is spawning them at a more rapid rate than ever before, and from all indications, capitalism is on the verge of plunging humanity into the most destructive war in history.

Thus all the evidence goes very heavily against Norman Thomas, and there seems to be no reason why anyone should re-evaluate Marxist thinking on this matter, or, as the New Leader so dashingly puts it, make "a complete revolution in socialist thinking."

The only question with which socialists need concern themselves is how and why capitalism breeds war, and, as a result, how and why socialism will end war. This whole question has been thoroughly analyzed by Marxists in the past, although Norman Thomas appears to have overlooked this work.

Capitalism is an expanding economic system. While this is a complex matter, it may be compressed into a simplified statement. The operation of every capitalist industry produces a profit: This is the object for which it operates. This profit is far larger than the capitalist and his dependents require for their own "consumption"; it includes a surplus which is then invested in an expansion of industry. This expansion of industry, by and large, proceeds at a faster rate than population growth, than market growth, or than the growth of an exploitable working class.

This expansion of capitalist industry, when it steps beyond national boundaries, manifests itself in several ways: a struggle for raw materials, a struggle for commodity markets, a struggle for places to invest capital, or in other words, a general struggle to enlarge the area and population subjected to exploitation by

the capitalist class. For this reason, capitalist economy tends to become war economy, until it reaches the present stage, where it can no longer work without war.

Modern capitalist wars stem from this basic fact. However, they no longer concentrate in disputes around this or that tiny oil territory, or this or that small market area. This was the case only with the earlier, more restricted capitalist wars. Today,



NORMAN THOMAS

giant capitalist powers or blocs of powers fight over whole continents, and even over the whole world.

For instance, in the case of the Spanish-American War, there were specific restricted areas over which Spain and the United States fought: Cuba, Puerto Rico, the Philippines, etc. However, in most of the capitalist wars since that time, the fight has been for broader stakes. That is why capitalist wars have tended to become world wars, in the period since 1900.

There are other types of wars today, but they are all caused, fundamentally, by capitalism. For example, the colonial countries have awakened and are fighting to free themselves from capitalist exploitation. These wars are also caused by capitalism, and if capitalism didn't exist, the reason for these wars would be eliminated. Even more, if capitalism didn't exist, the very national boundaries that are the starting point of wars would be wiped out, and the perspective opened up of a genuine international society without wars or the reason for wars.

The present war crisis is caused by capitalism, for the same fundamental reasons as previous war crises. Capitalism must reach out to dominate wider

areas, greater portions of mankind. But the revolutions of the past 35 years have narrowed the area left for capitalism to exploit. The Soviet Union, China, parts of the colonial world and Eastern Europe have been taken out of the grasp of the capitalist world. For this reason, world capitalism is uniting its forces under the reactionary leadership of Wall Street to restore capitalism where it has been wiped out, and to open up this one-fourth of the world to capitalist exploitation.

It should be noted that this analysis does not rest upon the personal ill-will of the capitalists, or their "evil" intentions. It rests upon the inescapable economic logic of capitalism, which cannot be halted short of its destruction.

That is the analysis of Marxism. There is nothing to justify discarding this analysis, everything to justify reaffirming it. Norman Thomas, probably the worst equipped man of our generation to "revolutionize" anything, least of all "socialist thinking," can't even make a dent in it. His article was intended, not to "clarify" socialism, but to help capitalism, and to justify in advance the coming war by pleading that it is a "non-capitalist" war caused by "aggressive Communism."

Opposition to Treaty Grows, Tokyo Correspondent Says

(Continued from Page 1)

Party, which split it into two. The right wing favored accepting the Peace Treaty but opposing the Security Pact. The left wing opposed both treaty and pact. At the special party conference held on Oct. 22-23 to decide this question, the right wing split away.

From Oct. 2 up until the conference the right and left wing leaders of the party continued their conflict in the central committee and the central executive committee on the treaty question. After three weeks, the left wing leaders finally surrendered to the right wing's position — to accept the peace treaty but to oppose the security pact — "for the sake of avoiding a split in the party."

At the party conference, however, the delegates of the overwhelming majority of the lower organizations of the party were decisively against both the treaty and the pact. The demands of the ranks dominated the conference so completely that there was no chance of maneuvering left to the left wing leaders.

On Oct. 24, after the right wingers had split away, the conference again met and decided:

"The Party opposes the two treaties in order to defend independence and peace. The Party will expel any betrayer who violates this decision." This was three days before the Diet voted on the treaties.

When the Socialist Party was split two years ago, the centrists were able to play the role of arbitrator and to patch up a reconciliation. But this time the masses did not give the centrists a chance to pull the same move. This time the centrists were swept away together with the right wingers, without uttering a single word. And the left wing leaders of the SP badly compromised themselves with the rank and file members, especially the youth, who are showing the greatest militancy at the present time.

Along with the strengthening of the movement for the "Four Principles of Peace," a new wave of labor struggle for higher wages has grown rapidly, and the Yoshida government has opened a drive to push through two repressive witch-hunt laws aimed against the unions and the anti-war movement. I will discuss both of these important developments in the letter I will send The Militant next week.

Aneurin Bevan: The Man and His Record

By Paul G. Stevens

Aneurin Bevan has been part and parcel of the British Labor Party leadership since 1945. Until his resignation from the cabinet last April, there was little to distinguish him, in public utterance at least, from any of the other opportunist leaders. But the workers have always regarded him as "their" man in the inner councils. Rumor attributed the stubborn course toward nationalization of the steel industry — the one nationalization measure that the capitalists fought desperately to prevent — to Bevan's pressure upon a reluctant cabinet.

A DIFFERENT BREED

The workers in the ranks have felt instinctively that Bevan was a leader of a different stripe from Fabian intellectuals like MacDonald or Cripps, do-gooder social workers like Attlee, machine politicians like Morrison or trade union bureaucrats like Ernest Bevin, who headed their movement in the past. By character and background, Aneurin Bevan is indeed a more authentic product of British working class development than any of the others. He is no revolutionary Marxist. But his ear is attuned to the pulse of the class struggle. And he is prepared to push ahead in that struggle when the masses show unmistakable signs of a desire to move in that direction.

Today, when the British masses leave no doubt of their dissatisfaction with the Anglo-American war alliance which capitalism has foisted upon them and show a restless impatience to "get on with the job" of transforming their country into a socialist nation, Bevan is definitely their man. It is going to be necessary to learn to know the man, his ideas and their background, for an understanding of the future world which they are bound to influence.

Aneurin (pronounced Anyrin) or Nye, as he has been known familiarly since his youth in the Welsh coal fields, was born in 1897, the son of a coal digger. He went to work in the mines at the age of 13 and soon became active in union affairs. He rose to prominence in the South Wales Miners' Federation, a hotbed of labor radicalism after World War I and the Russian Revolution.

He became famous in the crisis

year, 1921, as a leader of the unemployed in relief demonstrations. His union sent him to London to study at the Central Labor College later on in that decade. There the young miner developed his natural intellectual capacity and soon became a keen debater and brilliant orator.

In 1929 he ran for parliament for the first time from his native district of Ebbw Vale and was elected in the contest that resulted in the second minority Labor government of Ramsay MacDonald. He was among the first Labor MPs to stand up and denounce MacDonald's treacherous course which led to coalition with the Tories and Liberals, known as the National Government of 1931. That government initiated drastic cuts in unemployment relief as part of its program to meet the growing economic crisis. In the elections that year the Labor Party was decimated as a result of MacDonald's betrayal. Bevan, one of the few Labor candidates that survived, took a prominent part in the left wing of the party after the expulsion of MacDonald and Company.

In the 1930s he was associated with Stafford Cripps in the "Socialist League" which engaged in united front activities with the Communist Party and the Independent Labor Party in support of the Spanish Loyalists. At the 1936 Labor party conference, Bevan led the opposition "against any rearmament in the hands of a capitalist government," warning that "the next thing would be a demand for a complete political and industrial truce in the name of 'national unity' with the effect of leaving Labor totally disarmed and the reactionaries secure in power." His "Socialist League" work resulted in his expulsion from the party in 1939, along with Cripps. In 1940, however, the Miners' Federation sponsored his reinstatement, after he agreed to abide by party discipline.

During World War II, Bevan became the most vociferous Labor spokesman in the House of Commons against Churchill and, within the Labor Party, against continued participation in the coalition government. He was also noted for his attacks on the anti-radical, anti-strike legislation sponsored by Ernest Bevin, the powerful trade union bureaucrat who was Minister of Labor

in the wartime cabinet, and lent support to the case of the Trotskyists arrested in 1944 under the notorious "Regulation 1AA" which was part of that legislation.

In 1945 he led the struggle against Churchill's Education Bill in the House of Commons, which foreshadowed the breakup of the coalition. At the Labor Party conference that year, it was decided to challenge the Tories for power in the coming general elections. For the first time Bevan received the highest vote in the balloting for the National Executive Committee after pushing through an election program calling for large scale nationalization of industry.

When Labor won the elections, he became Minister of Health in the Attlee government and was the architect of the Health Plan, the most popular single measure adopted by the Labor government. "Nye's" popularity among the industrial workers increased steadily throughout the years, although they grew more restive with the policies of the government as a whole. Their patient attitude of "giving the leadership a chance" was wearing thin.

When the Trades Union and Labor Party annual conferences of 1950 showed that the rank and file of Labor was getting fed up with the harsh wage freeze and austerity while capitalist profits were treated gently, Bevan began to make more radical public speeches than his colleagues. The growing anti-war sentiment which enabled the revolutionary socialists grouped around the "Socialist Fellowship" to organize delegated gatherings representing hundreds of thousands of Labor Party members and trade unionists against the war in Korea undoubtedly played a part in convincing Bevan that the time had come for a break with the Labor leadership.

When the annual budget, announced in April 1951, revealed a cut in funds for the Health Plan along with an enormous increase in military expenditures, Bevan announced his resignation from the government. He was joined by two other ministers, Harold Wilson and John Freeman. A short time thereafter they published their views in a pamphlet. Insofar as Bevan has a program it is contained in that pamphlet, titled "One Way Only." (Next Week, Bevan's Program)

Sam Adams and the American Revolution: 4—

THE STRUGGLE BEGINS

By Harry Frankel

The observers of the great revolutions of history have described the holiday spirit with which the people begin revolts. Later on, when the insurrectionary masses learn the grim difficulties of their tasks their early festive mood changes to a more serious and determined attitude. But in the beginning, the mass of the working people, entering upon the stage to make history in their own name, do so with a great and wholesome glee. They are made happy by the new-found knowledge that they have the power to shape the world to their needs.

That is how it was in the American Revolution. When the mass opposition began in the early 1760's, it brought with it a fresh breeze, a glow of comradeship, a new and invigorating mood that penetrated every layer of the working population.

Stirred by the measures of the British in violation of colonial rights, by the search and seizure of sailing vessels, by the new taxes imposed by the British Chancellor of the Exchequer, the people began to gather in new organizations and mass meetings.

The Town Meetings

Town meetings, long an institution in New England, began to grow larger. These meetings customarily decided upon policies, and elected town officials. When the Revolution first began, there were about 1,500 people in the town of Boston entitled by law to attend town meetings and vote. The property qualifications kept the others out and the meetings were very small. But as the revolution proceeded, attendance at town meetings grew. Attendance reached two to three thousand and even as high as six and seven thousand in times of crisis. Moreover, the property voters, the only ones entitled to vote under the law, began to stay away, since, as they complained, when Sam Adams presided over a meeting, there were "very few gentlemen" present.

The people also began to barge in on the sittings of the Legislature. Later on, when the radicals had elected a number of their people to the Legislature, they opened the sessions to the public, and even had a gallery installed. Thus the great mass audiences followed politics in detail, and made their presence felt even where they were not permitted to speak but only sit and watch.

As the masses intervened more directly in the course of events, they built their own organizations, such as the Sons of Liberty, or Liberty Boys, and had their own meeting places. Foremost among the gathering places of the population were the town meetings at the old South Church and Faneuil Hall, and the Liberty Tree and Boston Common, where the outdoor mass meetings were held.

In the first flush of the popular rebellion, the masses found an idol in the young lawyer and orator, James Otis. A brilliant speaker and a colorful personality, he resigned from his government post as Crown Advocate in order to join the opposition.

When the British asserted their right to search and seize sailing vessels, Otis spoke for the opposition. He spoke new and startling words, and a great crowd flocked to hear him.

Otis dazzled his audience with a five hour blast against the crown government and its colonial supporters. He asserted the right of the colonies to self-management, and concluded with a ringing appeal for liberty. The crowds that had gathered to hear him in the court room, and who listened to him later at the town meetings, and at the Legislature, felt that they had found their spokesman.

Otis became floor-leader of the minority bloc of the General Court (Legislature), which soon numbered about one-third of the assembly. James Otis seemed to be one of the greatest men of the coming Revolution.

Sam Adams was becoming increasingly prominent during this same period. However, this early role was largely behind-the-scenes. Although not yet a member of the Legislature, he guided the work of the minority action through the Caucus Club and through personal discussions. Adams wrote many of the resolutions of the oppositionists, and continued his educational work in the columns of the Boston Gazette and other radical papers. But James Otis was the tribune of the people, the orator and popular leader in this early stage of the Revolution.

However, as the struggle became more serious, important weaknesses began to appear in Otis. He found it very hard to take the revolutionary road. He feared the growing mass movement. That is an unfailing sign, whenever it appears in a revolutionary leader, that he has chosen the wrong vocation.

"Until 1765," says one historian, "(Otis) was the leader of the debates in the House. But thenceforward, his opinions grew uncertain, and vacillated as circumstances altered. His fervid eloquence was always at the command of his country, but the direction of its torrent could not be relied on at all times."

The more compromise became impossible, the more Otis emphasized compromise and reform. He interlarded his speeches with the most lavish protestations of loyalty to the King. In short, he wanted to live in both worlds: the old regime, and the new one then being born.

The fevers of despair and indecision gripped him repeatedly, in the most crucial moments of the revolution. His course became ever more erratic. One day he would try to hold back the mass movement; to prevent some necessary forcible action. The next day he would challenge George Grenville (British Minister) to single combat on the floor of the House of Commons, winner take all. This was clearly the raving of a disordered mind, but there was a method in this madness. Otis reflected the American ruling classes, who hoped to find some way to settle all disputes with Britain, without calling the forces of the people into the arena.

Finally, the strain of the Revolution was too much for Otis. His mind snapped, and he ended his days in a strait-jacket. Otis had Hamlet-trouble: he couldn't make up his mind. He couldn't make up his mind for so long that he lost it.

Of course, this dilemma that plagued Otis and finally drove him insane was not his private problem. As we shall see, he reflected the situation of his whole class: the merchant-rulers of New England. The Revolution drove them half-crazy too. And, just as Otis' mind divided, so did the merchant class split over the Revolution.

Sam Adams Displaces James Otis

As the inadequacies of Otis grew plainer, and the needs of the Revolution sterner, Adams came to the fore. In the latter part of 1765, Adams was elected at a town meeting to fill a vacancy in the Boston representation to the General Court. Within a short time, he was clerk of the Legislature, and also presided over most town meetings as moderator. His power and popularity soon exceeded that of Otis.

Adams gained in influence because he offered the Revolution leadership, a program, and an unflinching allegiance which Otis could not give. He differed fundamentally from Otis in his whole approach to the struggle with Britain. While Otis was anxious to win, but not so anxious that he would favor smashing the Empire, Adams cared nothing for the British imperial structure. While Otis hesitated to call the working people into the fight, Sam Adams understood that without the great creative powers of the mass of the people, no revolution is possible.

In short, Sam Adams valued the objectives of the fight so highly, that he was willing to use every weapon required to win that fight. That is why his Tory contemporaries called him a "Jesus-uit" and modern historians parrot them, saying that Sam Adams believed in the "Jesusuitical maxim that the end justifies the means."

This change in leadership, from Otis to Adams, was like a switch in pitchers when the game goes into the hot innings. It is characteristic of all revolutions.

In the first blaze of revolutions, the people choose their leaders in a holiday spirit. Showmen, orators, often come to the top. These are people whose sounding words can sway the people momentarily, but they can never solve the knotty problems of the revolution.

Mirabeau and Lafayette in the first stage of the French Revolution, Kerensky in the opening period of the Russian, were of this type. But Mirabeau had to give way to Robespierre, and Kerensky dropped out of the picture as the people turned to Lenin and Trotsky. In the same way, when Sam Adams replaced James Otis in the affections and trust of the populace, the Revolution headed for more serious work.

(Next Week: The People Shouted!)

Negroes and Stalinism

By Jean Blake

Wilson Record, "The Negro and the Communist Party," University of North Carolina Press, 1951.

This new book on the Negro struggle in America is an important attempt to evaluate the relation between the Negro protest movement and radical ideology, and to outline a perspective.

Although it was written in a period of tremendous government pressure against radicalism, the author displays a remarkable degree of independence and objectivity.

While the bulk of the book is a critical account of the shifting policies of the Communist Party on the Negro question and an evaluation of its effect on the Negro protest movement against second class citizenship, Wilson Record begins with an examination of early reformist socialist ideas on racial discrimination. He points out that the early socialist ideology was inadequate because of its failure to adapt itself to the peculiarities of racial oppression here, and to recognize it as a special problem, with special strategic and tactical requirements.

The Communist Party, he demonstrates, developed techniques which made a greater impact on the Negro movement, but its ideology is basically incompatible with the native American protest movement since the CP line is based on the needs of the Stalinist bureaucracy in the Soviet Union. The writer correctly records the history of the twists and turns in Communist Party policy on the Negro question as functions of Stalinist diplomatic maneuvers, and correctly dates it from the time Stalin secured his bureaucratic stranglehold on the Soviet state, but he fails to note that this represented a departure from Marxism. He also neglects to examine the position of the genuine Marxist tendency, represented by the Socialist Workers Party, on the Negro question.

This inadequacy of the book is important since

the author's numerous references to the Trotskyists shows that he is familiar with at least some of their work on the subject. He quotes several paragraphs from *The Militant*, for example, criticizing the Communist Party's position on the Negro struggle during World War II, and observes that the SWP had developed a special position on the Negro question, but he fails to analyze it in the same scholarly way that he does the ideology of the Socialist Party and the Stalinists.

Mr. Record correctly sees a perspective for the Negro protest movement of alliance with native radical elements and the labor movement in a labor party.

"Negroes would constitute a valuable resource for any authentic third party movement built around organized labor," he writes. "To command the support of American workers — and of American Negroes — such a movement would have to be grounded in the native radical tradition. It would need more than a conglomeration of confused intellectuals, old-time pacifists, isolationists, and Communist hacks, such as the Progressive Party represented. Negroes have played an important role in shaping the American radical tradition; they are by no means loath to participate in its extension. . . ."

This perspective, as a further consideration of SWP literature on the subject would show, is the American Marxist view of the probable next stage in the Negro struggle for equality.

To complete the examination begun in his book, of the relation between the Negro protest movement and radical ideology, Mr. Record and others interested in the problem are referred to the "bound volumes of *The Militant*, *Fourth International* magazine, and pamphlets published on the subject by Pioneer Publishers. All are available at some of the larger libraries throughout the country, or may be purchased from Pioneer Publishers, 116 University Place, New York 3, N. Y.

"The Desert Fox"

By Charles Hanley

One of Hollywood's most reactionary motion picture companies, Spyros Skouras' Twentieth Century-Fox, has produced a movie about Field Marshal Erwin Rommel, based on a book by British Brigadier-General Young.

At a moment when the American and British governments are seeking to enlist the German military caste for their so-called western defense system, the making and showing of this film is no mere coincidence. The imperialists want to win the sympathy and cooperation of the German generals by such acts of moral reparation.

"The Desert Fox" pays tribute to those German officers who participated in the attempted assassination of Hitler in 1944 — when they became convinced that the war was lost. Fearing a possible social revolution as a consequence of total defeat, they wanted the German capitalists to negotiate with the Allies. The film even whitewashes some commanding officers who did not participate in the plot of July 20, 1944 — Field Marshal Gert von Rundstedt, for example, who consented to be a member of the Wehrmacht's Nazi "honor court" that expelled some of the unsuccessful plotters from the army before they

were hanged. (This episode is not mentioned in the picture.)

Erwin Rommel had already become an almost legendary figure before Hitler forced him to commit suicide — if we can call it suicide. The Fuehrer wished to avoid a public trial of Germany's number one war hero who had "betrayed" him.

Winston Churchill and Brigadier-General Young have praised Rommel's gallantry and tactical skill and his "respect" for the international rules of war.

Most of the German generals, including Rommel, supported the Hitler regime from the very beginning, as did the capitalists to whom the military caste is closely linked. Only when Hitler's war became hopeless, a war which they had helped to prepare and to conduct, did they abandon their leader and his fascist gang.

The true heroes of the German resistance movement were not the imperialist generals of the Wehrmacht, but the labor militants who fought fascism not only in 1944 but in 1923, 1930 and 1933 as well. These men and women, tortured in Hitler's concentration camps or hiding from the Gestapo, risked their lives in underground activities against the Nazi terror when Rommel and the rest of Hitler's generals were still dreaming of imperialist conquest and domination.

On Tour for Socialism

By Myra Tanner Weiss

The tour is now completed. I was welcomed home by the Los Angeles Local with a big dance at our party headquarters. Several musicians on an entertainment tour from Mexico played their guitars and we sang Mexican songs. The program also included a song by a lovely young soprano and several short speeches. The public meeting here was the second largest on the tour. A press conference at the Case Hotel was attended by a reporter from the Los Angeles Examiner and a reporter from the student paper at the University of Southern California. My work will be concluded with a tour of the branches in Los Angeles to give our comrades here a picture of the party nationally as I came to know it.

In the course of the two months' travel I made forty-six speeches, five of which were delivered on university campuses. In addition I had eleven radio, press, and television interviews. One would think with all that talking I'd end up with a sore throat. Instead I finished the tour with an ear infection. But aside from the slight pain in my ear, I feel so good I would like to start all over again.

As the Militant has reported, public opinion polls reveal that the Korean war is very unpopular. My own experience confirms this. There is no question that the overwhelming majority of the American people are opposed to this war. The imperialist and reactionary character of American foreign policy is hated by almost everyone. The Marxists, of course, have known the real character of the capitalist government for many decades. We arrived at our understanding of the role of the United States in world affairs through our scientific analysis. With the experience of the Korean war, this knowledge is now becoming a part of the thinking of the American workers and youth.

Of course, the opposition to the war will not stop the war or effect any major social changes as long as it remains in the realm of thought. But the destruction of old ideas and the formation of new ones is a necessary preliminary to the development of revolutionary action. We can't be impatient with the "slowness" of historic progress. We must understand this period as the years of great learning. By our intervention with our socialist activity and agitation we shall make sure that the correct lessons are drawn. Our 1952 national election campaign is our greatest opportunity. Precisely in this period of mass disillusionment, when new ideas can and must begin to take form, our effort to get our program before the broadest possible section of the working class can be most effective.

As this is my last column for the tour, I want to thank everyone for the work they did to make the tour a success. I was very grateful for the warm and friendly reception I received from every branch. For me the tour was an education and a great inspiration. If every member of our organization could have the privilege of seeing what the party is like nationally, I am sure that everyone would work with even greater confidence in the revolutionary future.

In almost every city I visited, I discovered that the party is rooted deep in the mass movements of the working class and youth. We have the most advanced, honest, and devoted socialist fighters in our ranks. As I think of all the men and women I met on the course of the tour, I am filled with pride to belong to such a party. I think of the words of an old song: "There's a power, there's a power, in a band of working men; when they stand hand in hand. It's a power, it's a power that can rule in every land."

MARXIST LABOR SCHOOL

116 University Place, New York City — Phone AL 5-7852

1951-1952 Winter and Spring Classes

"World in Crisis"	II. Marx's Capital,	III. The American
GEORGE CLARKE	Vol. 1	Revolution, the
Editor, Fourth International		Constitution, and
Friday Evening Lectures 8 PM		Democracy
Second Lecture in Series	MICHAEL BARTELL	HARRY FRANKEL
"The Soviet Bloc"	N. Y. Organizer, SWP	Author of "Sam Adams and the American Revolution"
Degree of Kremlin control and con- tradictions in the bloc.	24 Monday Sessions	12 Monday Sessions
The place of Eastern Europe, China, the colonial revolutions.	Starts on Monday, Dec. 3rd	Starts on Monday, Dec. 3rd
Is the Soviet Union "expansionist" and "imperialist"? What is the political significance of the theory of "peaceful co-existence"?	at 7:00 PM	at 8:45 PM
Is the Soviet bureaucracy a viable historic force? Can it sur- vive a new war?	Complete Course: \$8.00	Complete Course: \$4.00
Cost per session in any of these three courses: \$.50		

VOLUME XV

MONDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1951

NUMBER 49

Progressive Party To Back Capitalist Candidates in '52

The Progressive Party is holding a number of regional conferences in preparation for its 1952 election campaign. The first of these, held in Philadelphia, gave a pretty fair indication of what can be expected from the Wallaceites-minus-Wallace in next year's campaign.

The conference agreed that the party would run an "independent peace presidential ticket." It did not consider who would run on this ticket, a matter presumably to be settled at a nominating convention next summer.

A 'FLEXIBLE' POLICY

The conference also adopted a "flexible" policy for the congressional elections. This does not mean that the Progressive Party itself will contest most of the congressional seats. While it may do so in certain districts, in most cases the party will support "Negro, labor and peace candidates either in the Republican or Democratic parties."

In other words, it commits itself in advance to support capitalist party candidates who happen to be Negroes, or who happen to hold membership in labor unions, or who happen to favor a "Big Five meeting for peace."

To make the meaning of the policy unmistakable, the conference also decided that it would enter primary contests to get such candidates nominated. That is, the Progressive Party not only will support capitalist candidates but its members will register as members of the old parties so as to participate in its primaries.

There can be no question about this policy being "flexible." The question is: What is "independent" about it? There certainly is no need for a separate party to carry out such a policy.

MAKES NO SENSE

If the Progressive Party were a really independent party with an independent policy, if its aim were to convince the workers to break cleanly and all the way with capitalist parties and capitalist politics and to take power on an anti-capitalist program, then its proposed 1952 policy would make no sense at all.

But that is not the nature and aim of the Progressive Party, and never has been. Its chief function is to act as a pressure agency to persuade one or both of the old parties to agree to a Washington-Moscow deal based on carving the world into two "spheres of influence" and maintaining the status quo in both.

FOOLING THE WORKERS

That is why it is perfectly possible, and even logical, for the Progressive Party to send its members back into the capitalist parties. You can't educate workers that way to understand the need for independent labor political action, but you can use them that way, temporarily, for pressure purposes that have nothing to do with independent labor political action.

But only temporarily. Because, in the long run, the effect of the Progressive policy is to demoralize even radical workers who are influenced by it. What do they want with a Progressive Party when it tells them the way to promote peace is by working inside the capitalist parties?

TIME WILL TELL

As for the Progressive promise to run a presidential ticket, time will tell. It is known that the Progressive Party leaders are shopping high and low to find a suitable candidate — by which they mean preferably a capitalist politician like Henry Wallace, Glen Taylor, O. John Rogge and the other opportunists who headed their tickets in the past. But it is not excluded that they may decide eventually on the same "flexible" policy for the presidential campaign as they have decided on for the congressional elections.

Newark Fri. Night

Socialist Forum

presents a lecture on

The Life and Times

of "Longie" Zwillman (Newark's most famous native son)

Speaker:

George Breitman

Friday, Dec. 7, at 8:30

at 423 Springfield Avenue

Mine Wives Protest Company Holdup



Angry housewives stop miner on his way to work at mine in Harnamville, Pa., in protest against company move to force its workers to buy shacks at exorbitant prices. The miners were barred from work by their own wives and children in a demonstration to make the Consumers Mining Co., a Wheeling Steel Corp. subsidiary, lower sales prices on decrepit homes in which the workers have lived for years.

What Was Achieved by SWP In N.Y. Election Campaign

By Michael Bartell

While the traitor "socialists" were helping "Fearless Fossdick" Halley hoodwink the workers, the New York Local of the Socialist Workers Party was conducting the most successful campaign in its history. In 24 radio and television broadcasts, in the daily newspapers, at forums and street meetings all over the city, the real socialists levelled a powerful barrage against capitalist wars, witch-hunts, exploitation, and corruption.

For the first time, the name and some of the principal ideas of the SWP, became known to the entire politically literate population of New York City. This was the greatest achievement of the campaign. Most important in this connection were 17 radio broadcasts over eight different stations, and seven appearances on four television channels. Two of the television broadcasts were nationwide hookups, seen by millions. The 15 minute interview on Kate Smith's program reached an estimated audience of eleven million.

PRESS COVERAGE

The success achieved on radio and TV compelled the daily newspapers to devote more space to the SWP campaign than ever before. The Harlem press gave a fuller coverage than ever before to the platform of the SWP. The endorsement by the SWP of two Negro candidates running for office on the American Labor Party line aroused a very lively interest in the Negro community, with the press reporting the reactions of the various political forces.

In addition, we spoke directly to thousands of people at 15 election forums sponsored by neighborhood organizations and student clubs in all boroughs except Staten Island. Thousands more were reached by SWP campaigners at 25 outdoor meetings, door to door electioneering and through the distribution of 10,000 copies of our election platform and five special leaflets directed to particular segments of the labor and radical movement.

SPECIAL IMPORTANCE

Of special importance were the first modest campaign activities conducted in the rapidly growing Puerto Rican community, including a 15 minute speech over a radio station whose audience is predominantly Puerto Rican, the distribution of a leaflet written in the Spanish language, a street corner speech in Spanish, and a write-up of the SWP platform in a Spanish language daily.

The response of the public to the hard-hitting socialist campaign, especially to the demand that the GI's be brought home immediately was favorable beyond all expectations.

After almost every meeting the SWP candidate received enthusiastic comments such as: "It's good to hear one candidate who tells the truth and has the courage to speak out against the war and the witch-hunt. Keep it up." From a taxi-driver in Queens: "I wish there were a thousand like you out here." And from many others: "I had no intention of voting for you before I came to this meeting, in fact I had never heard of your party. But I'm certainly going to vote for you now."

THE SWP VOTE

The vote received by the SWP, approximately 3800 (the official

tally is not yet in), reflects only in small measure the support won in the campaign. Because of the record low registration, many who heard the SWP for the first time were unable to vote. This is especially pertinent, since it was precisely those who were disillusioned in all the old parties, who refused to register. Furthermore, the majority of the new supporters won by the SWP were not yet prepared to vote for a small party and cast their vote for Halley as a lesser evil to Tammany.

Yet, in spite of these handicaps, this was by far the highest conscious SWP vote to date. In the gubernatorial elections of 1950, the SWP received 13,135 votes in New York City, but the bulk of these were traditional "socialist" votes, since neither the Socialist nor the Liberal Parties ran independent candidates.

This was the first election in which both reformist political machines, the Liberal Party and ALP, ran independent candidates, and virtually the entire traditional "socialist" vote went to Halley. A valid comparison is with the elections of 1948 and '49 when the ALP and the SP ran independent candidates. In 1948, a presidential year with a registration twice as high as 1951, the SWP candidate received 2249 votes. In 1949, with a much higher registration than this year, the SWP mayoralty candidate received 1379 votes.

EFFECT ON STALINISTS

Another important achievement of the campaign was the powerful impact made upon rank and file Stalinists and ALP members. Most of these, sincere fighters against imperialist war and reaction, had known about "Trotskyism" only through the slanders of the Daily Worker and the Stalinist leaders. Through numerous channels we learned of their amazement to hear from the "counter-revolutionary Trotskyists" the only uncompromising attack against the war and the whole capitalist system, a defense of the colonial revolutions and a ringing crusade for socialism.

Their own ALP candidate limited his campaign to reforms, "peace at the 38th parallel" and a five power conference. While these people were not yet ready to desert their own party, they were deeply impressed, and their attitude toward the SWP has already visibly changed. Sentiments for a friendly relationship and united front activities are more prevalent in their ranks than ever before.

SIGNIFICANT GAINS

The SWP made significant and lasting gains in this campaign. It has won the recognition, the respect and admiration of many thousands. Most of these are not yet ready to accept in full our revolutionary ideas, or affiliate with the party. But as the radical moods begin to develop as a result of economic pressures and the revulsion against war, these people will know where to turn to find an honest, courageous, fighting socialist party. Already the party has begun to recruit from the new circle of friends won in the course of the campaign, and it is certain that for years to come, many of the recruits will relate that they first became aware of, and interested in, the Socialist Workers Party in the 1951 election campaign.

Seattle Court Action Tests Union Gag Rule

By A. Taylor

SEATTLE — Seaman John A. Mahoney's legal battle to win reinstatement in the Sailors Union of the Pacific has ended, after 19 days in court, and Judge MacDonald's decision is expected in a few weeks.

The closing three days of arguments of the attorneys from both sides clearly confirmed what the preceding testimony had shown — that the lawsuit of John Mahoney vs. Harry Lundberg et al was a conflict between militant unionism and labor solidarity on one side, and bureaucratic privilege and union-raiding as defended by the SUP officialdom, on the other.

The spectators at the trial, the majority of them union men, were visibly shocked by the anti-union speeches of Tanner and Levinson, attorneys for Harry Lundberg. Lundberg's lawyers told the court that the principle of labor solidarity defended by Mahoney would mean ruin for the union. It would mean that the union would not go through picket lines. This would result in depletion of the union's treasury and the endangering of its contracts with the shipowners.

In an attempt to show the judge just how "dangerous" Mahoney is, Lundberg's attorney shouted: "This man believes in the slogan that 'An injury to one is an injury to all!'"

In his rebuttal, Mahoney's attorney, John Schermer, proved by referring to the West Coast Sailor, the union's paper, that this slogan was a motto of the Sailors Union in the past and was repeatedly cited in many of its articles.

The slogan "An injury to one is an injury to all" was indeed one of the key principles upon which the SUP was built. But Harry Lundberg and the rest of the officials gave up this principle when they transformed themselves into labor dictators. They expelled Mahoney and many others for continuing to believe in this slogan.

Schermer contended that Lundberg had expelled Mahoney without just cause. The sole charge against him was that he had asked a question about union policy in a union meeting. Mahoney had asked: "Who gave the

officials authority to send men through the Canadian Seamen's picket lines?" Lundberg's attorneys claimed that Mahoney asked the question as a provocation, and that he was in league with "outside forces" for the purpose of taking over the union.

Mahoney's attorney showed that this allegation was nonsense and hit home on the main issue involved: Did Mahoney have the right to ask a question on union policy at a union meeting? Could the officials expel him without a proper trial and in violation of the union's constitution?

Schermer noted that the only witnesses testifying for the SUP officialdom were officials or men who had been on the pie and expected to get back again. It was literally a parade of the SUP bureaucracy. Their testimony did not stand up under cross-examination as one Lundberg witness contradicted the next.

In contrast, Mahoney's witnesses were rank and file union members, veteran SUP militants, who had been expelled for defending Mahoney's union rights. Schermer reminded the judge of the testimony of Joe Mattsen, a member of the union since 1910, who had been fined \$500 and put on ten years' probation by the Lundberg machine for his support of Mahoney.

"Where are Mahoney's other witnesses?" Schermer asked. "They are the 210 men who were at the meeting when Mahoney asked the question that led to his expulsion." He then read from the West Coast Sailor an article that threatened with expulsion any member who went to court against the union. "These men have been intimidated by the union officialdom from coming here as witnesses," Schermer said. "That is why they are not here."

In his final plea Schermer stated that if the court decided to reinstate Mahoney it would give to the hundreds of rank and file members of the SUP new courage to express their opinions freely inside the union.

AL LYNN

(Aug. 28, 1918 -- Nov. 23, 1951)

By Myra Tanner Weiss

Comrade Al Lynn died suddenly Friday night, Nov. 23. A member of the Los Angeles Local Executive Committee of the Socialist Workers Party and Financial Secretary of the local, Comrade Lynn

has been active in the revolutionary socialist movement for about thirteen years. He joined the Party in New York City and worked in the New York local before transferring to Los Angeles in 1943. Since then Al functioned in the leadership of our movement here. He worked continuously in a full-time capacity, taking charge of every department of work at one time or another.

Al suffered from the heart disease of rheumatic fever since childhood. Despite this severe handicap Al knew what he wanted to do with his life. He wanted to work for a socialist society. And he did everything possible to make the maximum contribution to the movement. There was no false pride. There was no morbid pampering of self that often goes with long illness. There wasn't even a consciousness of the heroism of his way of life.

Thinking of the many times Al came to meetings with his ankles swollen and his breathing difficult, remembering his increasingly grayish pallor, some may ask if he might not have prolonged his life if he had not worked so hard for the Party. First, Al would have refused to pay such a price for a longer life. A decent life in a capitalist world could only be found in struggle. Actually he prolonged his life by his work in the movement. He lived as long as he did because he had so much to live for and because he enjoyed living so much. Four years ago his doctor wanted to prepare me for what seemed then, not only inevitable, but quite imminent. "Al will live only a few weeks, perhaps months, maybe even a year," he said. The doctor didn't understand that Al just had to keep on living because there was so much work to be done. All these years I marveled at his strength, his endurance. Al, more than most, had discovered the good life. He was happy.

Friday afternoon he spent some time discussing Capital with Jim, a young comrade whom Al recruited. Al was helping him to catch up with one of the classes in Capital that had been formed before Jim joined the Party. After their class Al drove him and a visiting comrade from Berkeley to the street car. Then he delivered some shirts to the laundry. He returned to the car, started the motor, and then died. Our dear friend and comrade is gone.

Few of the comrades knew that he had the I.Q. rating of a genius. Only his poor, sick body stood in the way of his serving in an even greater capacity than he did. And even then, his stature as a political leader and Marxist theoretician, was continuously growing. His greatest happiness was to live in the world of ideas, to participate in the many discussions that always went on in our house. For four years he worked in my Capital class as a conscientious student and when after a great deal of study an idea would finally become clear, then he was happiest.

Al was loyal, devoted, serious and worked hard. But he also had a wonderful sense of humor. His wit was sharp and sudden. Whenever anyone made a particularly funny crack, we called it an "Alism." In the midst of the most serious discussions and particularly when we were tense over some unsolved problem, he would make some spontaneous joke that would send us into gales of laughter.

Al's life was short but it was as beautiful as life can be. From a man who knew he couldn't live long we can learn how to live well. He will be sorely missed. We who know best how much he gave to the future of humanity thank him first. We salute him with our red flag flying at half mast. The future happiness of mankind in the socialist world of tomorrow will owe him the greatest debt of gratitude.