

WORLD PROSPECTS OF CAPITALIST SYSTEM

By James P. Cannon
(See Page 2)

THE MILITANT

PUBLISHED WEEKLY IN THE INTERESTS OF THE WORKING PEOPLE

Vol. XVII - No. 2

NEW YORK, N. Y., MONDAY, JANUARY 12, 1953

PRICE: 10 CENTS

New Congress Swiftly Blocks Civil Rights Bills

The very first legislative action of the new Republican-controlled 83rd Congress, which opened last week, was to kill the possibility for passage of civil rights laws.

A coalition of Republicans and Democrats in the Senate adopted, 70 to 21, Senate Majority leader Taft's motion to table Senator Anderson's measure to revise the Senate rules which allow Southern Democrats to block action on civil rights by limitless filibuster.

The Democratic Senators themselves voted 29 to 15 in favor of Taft's motion. He had "the support of the Democratic hierarchy and of almost every powerful and

veteran Senator of both parties," observed the N. Y. Times.

The opening of Congress has also signaled a speeding up of the witch-hunt. Representative Velde, new chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee, and Sen. McCarthy, who heads the Senate investigating body, have both threatened to extend the government's purge of "reds" into the nation's schools and colleges.

McCarthy has stated that he intends to gun not only for "Communists" but for "Communist thinkers" — a clear indication of the Nazi-like thought-control the reactionaries intend to impose on the American people.

The AFL News-Reporter, official weekly of the American Federation of Labor, on Jan. 2 greeted the new Congress with the "hope that its Republican leaders, in power for the first time since 1946, will forego temptations to take partisan advantage and place the welfare of the country first."

This hope appears especially naive, if not thick-headed, in the light of the very first moves of Congress. Both Republicans and Democrats place their own welfare, and that of the capitalist class they serve, first, last and all the time. Asking them to forego the temptation of serving their own class interests is like asking a tiger to change its stripes.

Instead of issuing these futile, whining appeals to the reactionaries of both parties, the union leaders would serve the interests of the workers most effectively by launching a Labor Party and fighting for political power in labor's own name.

The Republicans know they have nothing to fear from a labor movement tied to the capitalist political machines and servilely begging not to be kicked. But the reactionaries would not talk and act so tough if labor moved with its own mighty party to boot them all out of Washington.

President Paz ascribed the attempt to "reactionaries who infiltrated the MNR and betrayed its ideals." The punishment reportedly meted out to them was light. The officers are to be cashiered and the civilians expelled from the MNR.

Juan Lechin said the incidents justified the opposition to reconstitution of the regular army which was shattered last April by the popular revolution. Since then the masses have retained arms.

Under pressure from capitalist and landlord elements, agents of the tin-mine monopolists whose holdings have been nationalized, and the American State Department, Paz has been inclining toward the right.

The attempted coup d'état underlines the warnings of the Bolivian POR (Revolutionary Workers Party) about the danger to the revolution from concessions to the tin interests, their native supporters and imperialist backers.

U.S. casualties in the Korean "police action" now total 128,530 a rise of 292 above the previous week's total. Included are 22,627 killed, 93,129 wounded, 9,292 missing and 2,091 captured.

NEW YORK — The tenth anniversary of the death of Carlo Tresca, editor of *Il Martello* (The Hammer), will be commemorated Saturday, Jan. 10. Flowers will be laid at 1 P.M. at the northwest corner of Fifth Ave. and 15th Street where the well-known labor leader and anti-fascist fighter was shot down in 1943.

Despite promising leads, police have not yet apprehended the unknown murderer.

Norman Thomas, chairman of the Tresca Memorial Committee, on announcing the anniversary plans, scored Ed Reid, Brooklyn Eagle reporter and author, for his failure to back up a charge by him that Italian fascists paid \$500,000 for the political assassination. Reid charged that the money was paid to a crime syndicate but he did not substantiate the allegation when questioned by the District Attorney's office.

These belated admissions "right

Eisenhower Arouses World's Fear of Expanded Korea War

Lead Fight Against Police-State Law



Temporary officers of Citizens Committee against the Trucks Law shown at press conference in Detroit where they announced aims of committee of 200 prominent citizens to defend civil liberties against infamous Trucks Act passed last year by the Michigan legislature. Above left to right are Charles C. Lockwood, attorney for the Greater Detroit Consumers Council, Kenneth C. Boulding, Prof. of Economics, University of Michigan, Committee Chairman the Rev. I. Paul Taylor, Pastor, St. Matthews Methodist Church, Ernie Mazey, Executive Board Member, Local 212, UAW-CIO, and the Rev. Robert Bradby of the Greater King Solomon Baptist Church

MICH. CITIZENS COMMITTEE HAILED FOR DEFENSE OF CIVIL LIBERTIES

NEW YORK, Jan. 8 — "I consider the formation of the Citizens Committee Against the Trucks Law one of the most promising signs for civil liberties in the United States for the coming year," Farrell Dobbs, National Chairman of the Socialist Workers Party, declared in a statement today.

"Though witch-hunting has hit a new high and though unscrupulous politicians are crowding onto the bandwagon of 'loyalty' purges and MacCarthyism, far more significant is the fact that in Michigan several hundred outstanding people from the labor movement, from the professions and from the academic world have banded together to fight this vicious example of thought-control legislation — the Trucks Law."

"The Citizens Committee Against the Trucks Law may well serve as a model in other states for those who want to preserve traditional American liberties under severe attack," Dobbs continued. "Witch-hunt laws like the Trucks Law can be compared to disease epidemics. They must be fought and stamped out. One cannot stop and inquire into the

political beliefs of those attacked by the disease before giving assistance. If one fails to defend a victim of the Trucks Law because of disagreement with the victim's beliefs, he is violating the fundamental concept of democracy and in fact indirectly helping to spread the anti-democratic disease that can be fatal to all thought. The Citizens Committee Against the Trucks Law has recognized this fact and it is greatly to their credit in these days that they defend minority political groups, such as the Socialist Workers Party, with whose beliefs they differ."

Interviewed by the Detroit correspondent of *The Militant*, Ernest Mazey, Secretary of the Citizens Committee Against the Trucks Law, said that formation of the committee had received wide publicity in the press and that already a number of people had written in asking to join. Also contributions have begun to come in to help defray the legal and other expenses the committee will incur. Mr. Mazey expressed his gratitude for this aid which is so urgently needed by the committee and asked that all friends of the committee give maximum support.

Two court challenges of the Trucks Law are in progress. One was instituted by the Socialist Workers Party, the first organization against which action under the Trucks Law was taken by Michigan authorities. This case is in the state courts. The SWP suit, which is supported by the Citizens Committee Against the Trucks Law, attacks the whole law as unconstitutional, including the provisions for the arbitrary labelling of any organization as a "Communist front" without evidence or allowing the victimized organization the opportunity to defend itself. At present this suit is on the calendar of Judge Lila Neuenfeldt of the Wayne County circuit court.

The other case was instituted by the Communist Party in the federal courts. It concerns only those provisions of the law which apply directly to the Communist Party. Last July a three-man federal court in Michigan ruled two to one against this suit. The decision has been appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court, which has agreed to hear an appeal.

The address of the Citizens Committee Against the Trucks Law is 1709 Ford Bldg., Detroit 26.

A Correction

In the issue of January 21, 1952, an article from Buffalo, New York, was printed in which there were contained some statements concerning a police lieutenant Schultz, head of the anti-subversive squad of the Buffalo Police Department.

The article referred to Police Lieutenant Schultz "as one of those listed on the payoff rolls of the pinball racketeers, at the rate of \$50 per week." The *Militant* has learned that Police Lieutenant Schultz who heads the anti-subversive squad is not the Lieut. Schultz so listed.

The *Militant* regrets the publication of the statements referred to above, and has caused this article to be printed so that our readers may know that the said statements were inaccurate.

(See editorial on page 3.)

Since June 26, 1952 when the campaign of "defiance of unjust race laws" started in South Africa 8,065 demonstrators have been imprisoned. Officials of African and Indian organizations announced that the campaign of defiance would be intensified in 1953.

Churchill's Visit Here Shows British Concern Over General's Course

By Joseph Keller

Fear that Eisenhower will extend the Korean War appears to be a major factor in 78-year-old British Prime Minister Winston Churchill's unscheduled mid-winter trip

to the United States for conferences with the President-elect even before he takes office. At the moment of his arrival, Churchill stated in a press interview that "we think it would be a great pity for the United States and the United Nations army to wander all about this vast China. We think it would be a great pity to make an indefinite extension of the war."

These remarks on Korea by this old British imperialist war dog and his relatively soft and restrained tone, in contrast with his customary warlike bombast, indicate the grave concern of the British ruling class, as well as the British masses, over the recent statements and actions of Eisenhower after his trip to Korea.

The General, far from making any peace moves in line with his election promises, has aroused fears all over the world that he intends to seek a military solution for the Korean war and might thus precipitate an all-out Asian war or even an atomic World War.

NO PEACE-LOVER

Churchill, of course, has not turned peace-lover. But he knows how costly the Korean war has already been and how greatly the British people would resent being dragged deeper into the Far Eastern military adventure of U.S. imperialism. If this war is the most unpopular in history for

us Americans, we can imagine how much more hateful it is to the people abroad.

Moreover, Churchill is concerned with maintaining what he called the "real center of gravity" in Western Europe, which the imperialist powers up to now have agreed is their key strategic base for war against the Soviet Union. A war "all about this vast China" at present does not accord with Churchill's views as to the best strategy.

Nowhere is the desire for a cessation of fighting and withdrawal of the foreign troops from Korea more burning and desperate than among the Korean people. Their homes have been destroyed, millions of them have been killed and maimed, and other millions wander freezing and starving as a result of the "strategic" bombings and "scorched earth" tactics of their U.S. "liberators."

"Koreans were told of the goodness of American principles, but they were not shown applied democracy. . . The Koreans and all Asians believe they would have a better chance of achieving freedom and national unity if they were severely left alone. . . Warnings against communist terrorism do not scare them; they feel that it cannot be worse than what they have." That is the considered conclusion of the pro-U.S. Korean Eastern military adventure of U.S. imperialism. If this war is the most unpopular in history for

FEATURE KUTCHER CASE ON AFL RADIO HOOK-UP

NEWARK, Jan. 6 — Frank Edwards, radio commentator sponsored by the American Federation of Labor, gave nationwide publicity last Tuesday to the second case of the legless veteran, James Kutcher, one of the first victims of the government "loyalty" purge, who is now threatened with eviction from a federal housing project here.

Edwards, whose program is carried by the Mutual Broadcasting system, reported that Kutcher had decided to challenge in court the new law designed to evict from low-rent housing all members of any organization on the Attorney General's arbitrary "subversive" list.

The new law requires the heads of all families in the federal projects to sign an oath certifying that no member of the family belongs to any of the listed organizations. Kutcher, who does not have to sign, his sick, 73-year-old father, who is required to sign and is willing to comply with the law, cannot do so because his son is well known as a member of the Socialist Workers Party.

Thus the whole family is threatened with discriminatory punishment because of the views of one of its members. Kutcher's father, who would find it a great hardship to move, will be able to remain living where he is only by driving his disabled son out of their home — unless the law is declared unconstitutional or repealed.

HELPED BY ACLU

To protect his father and to defend his own right to belong to any legal organization that he chooses, Kutcher decided to take the oath to court. He is being represented by the American Civil Liberties Union, through its New Jersey counsel, Emil Oxfield.

In a letter printed in last Saturday's Newark News, Kutcher explained his decision, thanked the ACLU for its help and expressed

his confidence that "the Supreme Court, which has already termed the Attorney General's list 'patently arbitrary,' will rule that the housing oath is unconstitutional."

The ACLU's suit was originally scheduled to be filed last Friday, but filing has not taken place up to the present time. The Newark Housing Authority has likewise not acted yet to formally institute eviction proceedings against any tenant who did not comply with the law in the three-day period set for this purpose.

Kutcher's first case also received wide attention this week when it was cited by Secretary of State Acheson in a memorandum to President Truman. Acheson referred to the recent Circuit Court of Appeals decision on Kutcher to confirm his contention that he, Acheson, rather than the Loyalty Review Board, had to make the final decision on the "loyalty" status of the diplomat John Carter Vincent.

That actually was one of the least important aspects of the Circuit Court decision. The Court upheld Kutcher's claim that his discharge from a Veterans Administration job in 1948 was improper, and reversed the discharge, but left Kutcher in the status of a suspended employee pending further action by the VA.

The reason it gave bears directly on the housing oath. The court ruled that membership in the Socialist Workers Party or any other group listed by the Attorney General is not sufficient cause to justify discharge of a government employee. Yet the same thing is now being offered as sufficient cause to justify eviction of housing tenants.

Plans Announced For Memorial To Carlo Tresca

NEW YORK — The tenth anniversary of the death of Carlo Tresca, editor of *Il Martello* (The Hammer), will be commemorated Saturday, Jan. 10. Flowers will be laid at 1 P.M. at the northwest corner of Fifth Ave. and 15th Street where the well-known labor leader and anti-fascist fighter was shot down in 1943.

Despite promising leads, police have not yet apprehended the unknown murderer.

Norman Thomas, chairman of the Tresca Memorial Committee, on announcing the anniversary plans, scored Ed Reid, Brooklyn Eagle reporter and author, for his failure to back up a charge by him that Italian fascists paid \$500,000 for the political assassination. Reid charged that the money was paid to a crime syndicate but he did not substantiate the allegation when questioned by the District Attorney's office.

Progressive Party Faces "Modification"

By Art Preis

The Communist Party leaders have finally offered an explanation to their members and followers for the debacle of their Progressive Party adventure. This explanation is contained in a "Draft Resolution on the Situation Growing Out of the Presidential Elections" issued by the National Committee of the American Socialist party. Published in *The Worker* of Dec. 28, 1952, the resolution presents what the CP leaders call the "main weakness" of their policy in the 1952 elections and their proposals for future electoral activity.

An unusual feature of the resolution is a virtual admission that it might have been better if the Progressive Party had never been set up; that no "great new mass party" opposed to the two Wall Street parties can be built without the trade unions as its chief base; and that the PP "is not and cannot be a major vehicle in the emergence of a mass people's party led by labor."

These belated admissions "right

out of the horse's mouth," as the saying goes, put a sort of final confirmation on what *The Militant* said about the nature of the Progressive Party and its probable course from the moment of its founding five years ago.

What the CP leaders now admit about the PP's lack of a labor base and their misrepresentation of the PP as a "new mass party of the people" is, however, only incidental to the main line and aims of the resolution. It affirms and deepens the false political principles and program from which the ill-starred Progressive Party itself stemmed. The objective of the resolution is not to demonstrate the immediate need for a Labor Party, but to subdue "third party" talk, to project new "coalitions" with "progressive" capitalist party candidates and organizations and to insist on participation in the Democratic Party along with "progressive" elements within that corrupt capitalist machine.

The CP leaders do not examine their policy with respect to the PP in any fundamental or prin-

ciple sense, but solely from a "tactical" point of view. They insist that the CP "correctly supported" the PP program of "progressive capitalism" and the PP national ticket in 1952, while indicating that it might have been better if the PP had never been set up in the first place. Aside from its incidental self-revelations, their resolution is loaded with half-truths, omissions, evasions and contradictions.

It is not clear from their resolution whether the Stalinists intend to inter the Progressive Party or to keep the unbureaucratic, or portions of it like the American Labor Party in New York, still lying about in an advanced state of putrefaction. While they put major stress on "coalition" politics and support of efforts to "extend labor's influence" inside the Democratic machine, it is quite possible that the Stalinists may seek to maintain a skeleton PP which can serve them as an occasional electoral front and can be conveniently manipulated to put forward Stalinist propositions. On

the future of the PP, the resolution says only that the PP "requires a substantial modification of its role."

TRACE "FAILURES"

The CP leaders now trace their "failures" of the recent campaign to "the mistakes made in the 1948 election campaign" and "the failure of the national leadership of the Party to examine objectively and fearlessly the outcome of the 1948 elections." This "objective and fearless" action is undertaken only after the 1952 election, when the PP vote fell to some 140,000 — about 12% of the admittedly low Wallace vote of 1948.

The "conclusions" that should have been drawn "after the 1948 election, they now say, is that 'it was incorrect to have favored the departure of the Wallace forces without masses from the Democratic Party' and that the Wallaceites should have been encouraged 'to fully unfold the struggle for peace within the Democratic Party.' The CP leaders make no mention of how

Wallace actually "unfolded the struggle for peace" in the PP by desertion to the open imperialist war camp at the first pretext, the outbreak of the Korean war.

They do admit, however, to "a right opportunist exaggeration of the role which liberal bourgeois forces (around Wallace) could play in bringing about a basic political realignment in the ranks of the working class and its allies."

Even worse, they made "the wrong estimate that the formation of the PP represented . . . the emergence of a great mass People's Party. This estimate erroneously ignored the fact that . . . there could not emerge a great new mass party as against the two parties of Wall Street until the labor movement . . . had been broken from the two-party system, particularly the Democratic Party . . . the formation of a BROAD and MASS peoples party in the U.S. . . must arise out of the basic mass trade union and people's organizations."

(Continued on Page 4)

World Prospects of Capitalism and Socialism

By James P. Cannon

(The following lecture was given at the Los Angeles Friday Night Forum, Dec. 12, 1952. It is the second of a series on "America's Road to Socialism.")

Almost as soon as I was old enough to look around and see and think for myself, I rebelled against the poverty, injustice and all-around crookedness of capitalism. I became a socialist and joined the movement when I was a boy, and have been working at it ever since.

And if I made a mistake, I can't say I wasn't warned. Quite a few practical people who were interested in my welfare and thought I was marked for success in life, began to shake their heads sadly when they heard me popping off on the street corners about socialism.

"It's a fine idea, son, but it'll never work," I was told. "It's against human nature." "There always have been rich and poor and there always will be. Be a realist. Don't waste your life on a Utopian dream that can never be realized. If you want to get ahead in this world, you've got to be practical and look out for Number One."

I mention this to show you that I know all the arguments against socialism. I heard them more than 40 years ago. And I won't say that I didn't pay attention to them. I did. Especially the argument that socialism is a Utopian dream that can never be realized. I was then, as I am now, inclined to realism, and I never saw any point in expending energy on impossible and unrealistic projects. The argument that socialism is not practical and not realizable worried me.

It was this troubled frame of mind that brought me, more than 40 years ago, to an open forum such as this, conducted by the Socialist Educational Society in Kansas City.

I went there in search of more detailed information about this thing called socialism, which charmed me and inspired me with its grand promise of the future society of secure peace and abundance for all; a society based on equality, solidarity and comradeship.

It was there at that forum that I got my first introduction to the ideas of Marx, the ideas of scientific socialism. From the discussions of that forum and the further study inspired by them, I became acquainted with Marx's analysis of capitalism, and his sweeping assertion that socialism is not only a good idea, but is the next inevitable stage of social evolution; that the further development of capitalism cannot lead to anything else but its downfall and the socialist reorganization of society.

That did it. That settled all my youthful doubts about the practicality and realizability of the idea. It convinced me theoretically, and that is the firmest conviction there is, that all the forces of history were working on my side, on the side of socialism, and that all I had to do was lend a little help, along with others, to help the historic process along.

Compared to the privilege of participating in this magnificent historical mission, all the so-called practical concerns of life and the possible material rewards of conformity seemed trivial to me more than 40 years ago, and they still do. I have never changed my mind about this question in all the

intervening years. That was not because of dogmatic obstinacy, but simply because I saw no good reason to change my mind.

I have always been willing to listen to anybody who would undertake to explain or make an argument against socialism from a realistic, practical point of view. As I went along I continued to hear those arguments, and still hear them if I cock my ear in the direction of the most noise.

Every theory must be submitted to the test of events. That applies to the theory of Marxism, just as Marx ruthlessly applied it to all other theories. If I grew stronger in my socialist convictions as the years passed by, it was because it appeared to me that the development of events was confirming in life the analysis and predictions of Marx.

It was Marx himself who said that no social system can be superseded until it has exhausted its progressive capacities. If capitalism is capable of further progressive development on a world scale, and is therefore invulnerable against any attempts to change it in a radical manner, then there is not much point in arguing that socialism would be a better system.

But on the other hand, if capitalism has lost its progressive character and become reactionary, has ceased to grow and



GEN. MARSHALL

"The Marshall Plan was contrived to let America's stricken allies in Europe live, or rather breathe, while strengthening America's grip on their economy."

expand and develop the productive forces of the people, upon which all human welfare is based; if it has entered into its period of decline and decay — then the optimistic defenders of capitalism are in the wrong. They are the real Utopians of the present day.

The issue, then, goes to the evidence, to the facts. Let us rest the case on this solid foundation of reality, and go to the facts as they have been unfolded in the great events of the past half century. If we look with clear eyes at what has already happened, we may get a good hint of what is going to happen.

If we can see enough in these events to indicate a historical trend, then we can be fairly sure of what the ultimate outcome will be. It is by this method and from this point of view that I propose to discuss the international prospects of capitalism and socialism tonight. Naturally, in a single lecture, it will be possible to hit only the high spots, and I will confine my presentation to what I consider the six main facts of modern history.

the whole of Europe was concerned. Europe, after the war, was ripe for revolution. But the workers were not yet ready with a party that could lead it and carry it through. They paid dearly for that unpreparedness. The result was a series of defeats for the workers. And on the basis of these defeats, with the help of American loans, capitalist economy in Europe slowly recovered and attained a new stabilization which brought new illusions of a new Golden Age of prosperity and expansion.

But no sooner was the new stabilization of capitalist economy proclaimed and celebrated than the whole world was again shaken to its foundations by the worldwide economic crisis touched off by the New York stock market crash of 1929. This time rich and powerful America, which had grown fat at the expense of other countries in the war, was hit hardest of all. Production was cut in half, and the living standards of the workers were reduced in about the same measure. This crisis put an end to all prospect of capitalist expansion on the basis of stable, democratic regimes and brought fascism to power in poverty-stricken Germany following the earlier example of poverty-stricken Italy.

Just as the world war had put an end to capitalist prosperity based on peace, the 1929 crisis and its aftermath put an end to capitalist prosperity in Europe based on democracy.

The economic crisis of 1929, and the resort of capitalism in Italy and Germany to the monstrous crisis-rule of fascism, can be put

down as important FACT NUMBER TWO. This was also bad for the prospects of capitalism, for it showed its economic system to be weakened, shaken and declining.

down as important FACT NUMBER TWO. This was also bad for the prospects of capitalism, for it showed its economic system to be weakened, shaken and declining.

The Superiority of Planned Economy

Meanwhile, earlier attempts of the great powers to overthrow the workers government of the Soviet Union were defeated, the victory of the revolution was consolidated on the basis of nationalized and planned economy, with a monopoly of foreign trade. This closed off the Russian market to capitalist exploitation from abroad. During the crisis, which dragged on in the capitalist world for a number of years and was never really overcome, Russian industry under the five-year plans progressed by leaps and bounds, multiplied its output many times and eventually brought the Soviet Union to second place in industrial production.

The survival of the Soviet Union in a hostile capitalist world, and its ability to increase and even multiply its productive capacity, while the economy of the capitalist countries was declining and stagnating, raises in the most striking and irrefutable fashion a hitherto unproved assertion of Marxism: That is the superiority, as a productive force, of nationalized and planned economy — which is immune from crisis — over the anarchic, unplanned economy of capitalism which cannot escape periodic crises. Here, in my opinion, is the key to the future development of the world.

This can be put down among our exhibits as FACT NUMBER THREE, the fact which shows the rise and development of a new social and economic system simultaneously with capitalist decline.

By 1939, the basic conflicts which had caused the World War to break out in 1914 had not been eliminated. On the contrary they reasserted themselves in a more aggravated form. Each one of the big powers, stifling in the still unresolved crisis which struck the capitalist world in 1929, saw its existence conditioned upon the acquisition and retention of foreign markets and territories and fields of influence for the export of its surplus goods and capital. The richer nations felt obliged to hang on to what outlets they had at all costs, and if possible to find new ones. German capitalism, on the other hand, defeated in the First World War, and suffocating in its restricted barriers, had to expand or perish. The same was true of Italy and Japan.

I think history will record the year 1939 as the fateful year of decision, which finally sealed the fate of capitalism as a world system; the year in which terrible economic difficulties brought about by the operation of the laws of capitalism, were supplemented and enormously aggravated by the bankruptcy of political and military decision. Capitalism lost the power to think for itself.

Here was the situation in 1939: The rival big powers of capitalism confronted each other as rivals of the same kind, of the same system, in the fight for a diminishing world market for trade and investment.

The Soviet Union, embracing one-sixth of the earth's surface, confronted all of them as a rival of a different kind, a rival representing a new and different social system, whose superiority over the social system of capitalism as a productive force had been demonstrated to the hilt in



ROOSEVELT

"In the name of the noblest ideals enunciated by Roosevelt, the greatest enunciator of them all... America waged the war in the Orient to drive the Japanese out of China and get this tremendous market, the richest prize in all the world, for itself."

down as important FACT NUMBER TWO. This was also bad for the prospects of capitalism, for it showed its economic system to be weakened, shaken and declining.

the prolonged crisis. The Soviet Union confronted the capitalist nations as a rival whose further existence and possible expansion could spell only death in the long run for the rival system of capitalism.

Moreover, the territory occupied by the Soviet Union had been withdrawn from the capitalist market since the revolution of 1917. And this fact in itself had contributed enormously to the economic difficulties of the capitalist nations, in Europe particularly.

It was the most imperative necessity of the capitalist nations in the fateful year of 1939, to take counsel together, and to unite in their own enlightened self-interest, to face their greatest danger, which was at the same time their greatest opportunity.

They were confronted with an overriding need to crush the Soviet Union and thereby to remove, for the time being at least, a rival social system from the world arena; and at the same time, to open up the Russian market for capitalist exploitation and get a new lease on life for the system as a whole.

The inability of the capitalist nations, because of conflict among themselves, to unite for this crucial and indispensable task in 1939, to save or at least to prolong their own life, was, in my opinion, the surest sign of their hopeless degeneration and decay, manifested by their inability even to think for themselves any longer.

It doesn't help matters any to say that it was all Hitler's fault and that Hitler was a madman. That is true enough. But what kind of social system is it when madmen can make it more important decisions? An historical law reasserted itself in this circumstance: the law that social systems which have outlived their time can't do anything right any longer. Instead of uniting to attack the Soviet Union, the rival capitalist imperialist powers embarked upon a war among themselves. The Soviet Union was at first on the sidelines, and later engaged in the war with the powerful allies, America and Great Britain. The results of the war are well known. Germany and Japan, which previously had



CHIANG KAI-SHEK

American statesmen and leaders "continued to bet their money on Chiang Kai-shek, the horse that had already lost the race."

menaced the Soviet Union from the West and from the East, were crushed. The colonial and nationalist revolutions, taking advantage of the difficulties of the imperialist masters during the war, were able to strengthen their forces and undermine the whole colonial system, without which world capitalism cannot operate.

And on top of everything, the most important thing of all, the Soviet Union emerged victorious from the war and rose to the position of the first economic and military power in Europe.

Let us put all this down in our list of exhibits as FACT NUMBER FOUR, as a brightly lighted sign-post pointing out the direction of future developments which were not long unfolding in the post-war period.

Formally speaking, the Axis powers — Germany, Italy and Japan — lost the war, and the Allied powers, the United States, Britain, the Soviet Union and France, won it.

That's the way formal history records the outcome, and that's the way Churchill, the world's most articulate wish-thinker,

Who Is Winning the Cold War?

After two victories in two world wars, Britain, once proud queen of the seas and banker of the world, ends up as a beggar, living on America's dole. Its days of glory have departed; its empire is shattered and falling apart, and all the King's horses and all the King's men can never put the jolly old empire together again.

France emerged from her victories in the two wars in the same position, only worse. The French empire is dying in agony on the battlefields of Indo-China. Capitalist Britain and France are just a couple of American satellites.

The United States and the Soviet Union came out of the war as the only winners — with one important qualification: the colonial world rose to its feet during the war and entered the arena of world history as an independent force. The course of history in the post-war period has been primarily determined by the relations between these three powers, the United States, the Soviet Union and the insurgent colonial world. All the other countries play merely supporting roles.

America's position in the new world set-up is a truly great one. Let no patriotic vigilante accuse me of minimizing it. I admit it, even if I'm not proud of it. The United States is the first and dominant power of the entire capitalist world, economically and militarily. It has the money and the bombs and the moral self-satisfaction too. What could be cozier than that? Our boys in Wall Street are doing all right by themselves. They don't even have to play a fiddle. All they have to do is whistle, and the others dance. But here we come to the fly in our ointment, or maybe it is somebody's thumb in

to it, gaining ground, or being pushed back?"

The answer to the riddle of the future is wrapped up in this formulation of the question.

Throwing the Fight

Obviously, America has been losing the first rounds. That's bad enough; the odds at the ringside always turn against a fighter who has to come from behind. But if our examination shows that America has not only been losing ground, but is the chief author of its own set-backs, the odds on the final outcome must be changed radically. No fighter is so sure to lose as the one who knocks himself out. And that, my friends — candor obliges me to report — is precisely what our great and glorious country, or more correctly the Wall Street people who own this country lock, stock and barrel — are doing in the battle for the championship of the world.

I charge them with throwing the fight. I accuse them before the Un-American Activities Committee, on my oath and without claiming any rights against self-incrimination — I accuse the Wall Street money sharks as the world's greatest and most dangerous revolutionists, as the chief instigators of social revolution, colonial revolt and nationalization of industry in the entire world.

Look what they have done in Eastern Europe. This territory wasn't "given away to the Russians at Yalta," as the irresponsible radicals on the lunatic fringe of the Republican Party say. It was simply a power vacuum filled by the Red Army as a result of its victory and the collapse of the Nazi war machine. Predominant Soviet influence in this territory was an ineluctable circumstance resulting from the war.

The question was how to accommodate this circumstance to the interests of American and world capitalism. Stalin, for his part, was willing to make such an accommodation. He offered, and in good faith too, to maintain and guarantee the capitalist



WINSTON CHURCHILL

"The world's most articulate wish-thinker."

writes it. The essential content within that outward form looks different. In reality, as measured by their actual position when the smoke cleared away, the Soviet Union and the United States emerged as the only victors, and all the others were losers; England and France no less than Germany, Italy and Japan.

our eye — that section of the world which is no longer capitalist, or is trying to break away from capitalism, doesn't want to dance to America's tune. A conflict over this matter has been in progress ever since the end of the war.

An examination of the course this conflict is taking is now pertinent to the question posed in the subject of our discussion: "The International Prospects of Capitalism and Socialism." The question might be put in another way: "Who is winning the cold war?" The question could be formulated in a third way and be even more precise: "Is revolution and the nationalization of industry, the economic foundation for socialism and the transition



STALIN

"... offered to maintain and guarantee the capitalist system of production and the capitalist form of governments in the countries of Eastern Europe."

to it, gaining ground, or being pushed back?"

The answer to the riddle of the future is wrapped up in this formulation of the question.

system of production and the capitalist form of governments in the countries of Eastern Europe. And that is precisely what he did in the first three years of the post-war period. He went further and offered to guarantee the capitalist system of production and capitalist political regimes in Italy and France, where they were badly shaken.

And that is precisely what he did there too, by sending Communist Party representatives into the bourgeois cabinets as supporting forces. Their special assignment was to curb the workers and suppress strikes, and they carried it out. In return for these truly great concessions to prop up the tottering system of capitalism in both Western and Eastern Europe, Stalin asked only a small concession in return — a deal.

"Let us alone in our part of the world," he said in effect, "and we will let you alone in your part. Let's co-exist and be happy."

But the rulers of America said, "No." Drunk with power and ignorance, combined perhaps with that senile dementia which invariably strikes the ruling circles of outlived social systems, they decided to "get tough" with Russia. They responded to Stalin's conciliatory policy in Eastern Europe with a stepped-up armaments program and the Marshall Plan.

The Marshall Plan was contrived to let America's stricken allies in Europe live, or rather breathe, while strengthening America's grip on their economy. At the same time it was designed to break the economies of the Eastern European countries out of the orbit of Soviet trade and harness them to the West. The Stalinists realized (they had no alternative) by breaking-up the bourgeois governments in Eastern Europe — they were so weak, lacking all popular support, that

they could be dismissed by a mere police action — and proceeding to the nationalization of the industries.

This was nothing less than an economic revolution, instigated by America and carried out by bureaucratic means. In France and Italy the Communist Party representatives were kicked out of the cabinets at the behest of the American paymaster. The Stalinists responded — again they had no alternative — by switching to a policy of opposition and radical agitation.

These are tremendous developments of world-historical import. The extension of the system of nationalized and planned economy, not socialism, but the economic foundation for it, to the whole of Eastern Europe means and can mean nothing else than the exclusion of this whole territory from the world capitalist market and a consequent shrinking of the capitalist sector of world economy, which is already too small.

The ouster of the Stalinists from the governments of Italy and France means and can mean nothing else than a stimulus to the radicalization of the working class in these two decisive nations.

Let us put down these colossal happenings, loaded with revolutionary dynamite, as FACT NUMBER FIVE, and ascribe the main responsibility to the revolutionary incendiaries of New York and Washington. "Father, forgive them, they know not what they do." That's the way it reads in the Bible, but history will not be so magnanimous.

The camera eye now shifts to China and the colonial world. And what a world of unexpected wonders and calamities, with signs and portents of more to come, it has turned out to be. American capitalism went fishing in the Orient and caught a whale big enough to sink the boat. The war in the Orient was fought over China. It was fought by America in the name of the noblest ideals enunciated by Roosevelt, the greatest enunciator of them all.

The declared aim of the war was to drive the Japanese imperialists out of China and liberate this great country of half a billion people; to secure for China, by the armed might of unanimous America, an independent, prosperous national existence.

"We Lost China"

But again something happened. Again something went wrong. America had staked all its cards on Chiang Kai-shek, the political and military leader of capitalist China. It allied itself with him and the narrow stratum of capitalists, landlords and usurers whom he represented, and overlooked the Chinese people, who number a half a billion, most of them hungry for land and bread.

These hungry people, just when the first half of the American plans were executed, with the defeat of Japan, most inconsiderately decided to get Chiang Kai-shek and his parasitic gang off their necks along with the Japanese. They started a ruckus, otherwise known as a revolutionary civil war. Chinese capitalism, deformed in its development by colonial exploitation of the great powers, had become senile before it reached maturity, senile, weak, corrupt and parasitical.

The Chinese capitalist government of Chiang Kai-shek, propped up by American money and military support, and without much else to lean on, was not strong enough to contend with the popular revolt. By 1948 the popular revolution had driven Chiang Kai-shek and his gang completely off the mainland of China.

And one bright day the world was suddenly confronted with a new China, which was really independent, but backward in its industrial development and eager to get foreign loans and credits. The government of Mao Tse-tung offered to guarantee the capitalist system of production and to guarantee all loans on that basis.

The statesmen and leaders of British capitalism, who are older, wiser and more experienced in world affairs, wanted to come to terms with the new reality, to recognize the new revolutionary government and continue trading with the new China.

But the American statesmen and leaders wouldn't have it that way. They can't understand how it happened. They feel that somebody copped them, and they are as indignant as a farmer who has been played for a sucker in a carnival shell game. China, according to their thinking, "belongs" to them and somehow or other, by some trick or other, they "lost" it.

That was a literal statement, repeated a thousand times in the recent election campaign: "We lost China." But did this great nation, with its half billion people and its unmeasured natural riches, really "belong" to them? Did Santa Claus promise them China



HITLER

"What kind of a social system is it when madmen can make its most important decisions?"

istence, free from all foreign domination and exploitation.

That's one way of explaining our war aims, anyway. Another way would be to say that America waged the war in the Orient to drive the Japanese out of China, and get this tremendous market, the richest prize in all the world, for itself, for its own unhampered exploitation. That would be a more accurate way of putting it.

The development of China on a basis of capitalist economy, with a stable government capable of guaranteeing the eventual repayment of loans and credits, could have provided America with an outlet for its huge surpluses of goods and capital for years to come.

And if the other capitalist powers were allowed to participate, even modestly, in the exploitation of this almost limitless market, they also might have overcome their internal crises and attained a new stabilization of their systems, also, for a period of years to come.

From a strictly capitalist standpoint, one must admit that such a prospect was well worth a war, even without any moralistic pretensions. And if the enterprise could be dressed up with idealistic bunkum at no extra cost, all the better. Anyway, we fought the war with Japan over China.

And the first half of the war aims were realized completely. Japan was driven out of China by military force, and even driven out of its other possessions, and condemned to stifle and stagnate in its own little chain of islands.

For Christmas and then fail to deliver? Did somebody shoot Santa Claus? That's what they seem to think. Anyway that's the way they carry on in their mad search for spies and other culprits in the State Department.

As for China itself, they arrogantly ordered the revolutionary war to subside; continued to bet their money on Chiang Kai-shek, the horse that had already lost the race; refused recognition to the new revolutionary Chinese government; refused them the loans and credits they were eager to get and to make concessions for; and established a virtual blockade against any foreign trading with China.

What are the results of all this wisdom? We can list the three most important ones: First, American policy alienated the sympathies of hundreds of millions of people throughout the Orient and the whole colonial world, who had previously taken our idealistic pretensions in good faith. Revolts and revolutions throughout the entire colonial world, starting in Asia, then spreading to the Middle East, then to Africa, and now already leaping across the South Pacific, are being fed today by hatred of American imperialism as gasoline feeds a fire.

The Korean war is a part of the colonial revolution. That's why it has presented so many surprises to the arrogant American militarists. The power of hunger is behind these revolutions — hunger for bread and land and national independence — and no power on earth can stop them.

The second result of America's policy of refusing to recognize the new Chinese government, refusing to trade with it, ordering a blockade against it, and even threatening war against it — the second result of this policy is to close off all possibilities of any further development of China on the basis of capitalist economy.

Regardless of what their intentions and wishes might be, the Chinese Stalinists at the head of the new revolutionary government will be forced, as were the regimes in Eastern Europe, to embark on a wholesale program of nationalization, as a condition for the survival and development of the country's economy.

China couldn't be developed on a capitalist basis, without a tremendous influx of foreign capital in the form of loans, credits and investments. Deprived of this blood transfusion, weak, undeveloped and shaken Chinese capitalism — whatever may be left of

(Continued on page 3)

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

THE MILITANT

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

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

Entered as second class matter March 7, 1944 at the Post Office at New York, N.Y., under the act of March 3, 1879.

Vol. XVII - No. 2 Monday, January 12, 1953

Some Significant Strike Figures

Preliminary estimates of the Dept. of Labor's Labor Statistics Division disclose that 1952 was the greatest strike year in American history except for the explosive post-war year of 1946. This holds true in every respect — number of strikes, number of workers engaged in strikes, number of man-hours of labor postponed or lost by strikes and number of strikes involving more than 10,000 participants.

Here is a brief comparative table of the most important figures:

Yr.	No. of Strikes	No. of Strikers	Man-Hrs. Lost
1946	4,985	4,600,000	116,000,000
1951	4,737	2,220,000	22,900,000
1952	4,950	3,500,000	55,000,000

There were 34 major work stoppages in 1952 compared to 19 in 1951. There were national strikes in two basic industries, steel and coal. The 55-day walkout of basic steel workers and the 12-day soft coal mines halt accounted for half the man-hours lost, just as the General Motors and steel strikes accounted for a large percentage of the man-hours loss in 1946. And the phenomenon of one, let alone two national industrial strikes, in any year was rare indeed before 1946.

The strikes last year were by no means strictly defensive. The coal miners notched their wages up \$1.90 a day and the steel workers made pay and welfare gains of about \$1.50 a day.

The great number of strikes and strikers and the gains they scored are all the more remarkable in view of seven years of mounting reaction, the anti-labor laws and witch-hunt and the efforts of the conserva-

tive union bureaucrats to stifle the militancy of the workers. These strikes battles were waged, moreover, in the midst of a war and during an election year when the pro-Democrat union leaders were trying not to "embarrass" the incumbent Administration.

The most significant and decisive fact for us is that the mighty American labor movement is intact; it is capable of powerful struggle; and it fights at any serious threat to its conditions. The combativity of the organized American workers in 1952 was not surpassed by any working class in any advanced capitalist country, England, France, Italy or Western Germany, with the possible exception of Japan.

The weak side of the American labor movement is its lack of political independence, its continued adherence to the two-party capitalist political monopoly. But this policy becomes more and more untenable and illogical. It is a fact that deep inside millions of workers there already dwells the desire for a party of their own. In the next four years of Republican administration, as the government frustrates the aspirations of labor and imposes new burdens of war costs and sacrifices, the sentiment for a labor party might swell to a flood and break the dikes of the opposition of the labor leaders. Whatever the course of developments, those who do not quail before reaction and who work with confidence in the American labor movement as the power which can and will break the backbone of reaction, will find this confidence rewarded in the years of great labor struggles ahead.

"The Militant" Stands for Accuracy

In the wave of reaction during the past few years, intimidation, force and violence against various sections of the labor movement have been a common occurrence. The Buffalo Branch of the Socialist Workers Party has been the special target of such intimidation by the anti-subversive squad of the local police force. As **The Militant** readers are fully aware, the Socialist Workers Party has fought the harassing actions of the Buffalo police with every ounce of strength at its command and **The Militant** has aided this resistance by giving it publicity and encouragement.

In its report of a meeting held under the auspices of the Buffalo Branch of the Socialist Workers Party, where the anti-subversive squad of the Buffalo police force resorted to various devices of intimidation, **The Militant** had mistakenly referred to the head of this anti-subversive squad as implicated with pinball operators. This was an honest mistake on the part of

The Militant. Since investigation has disclosed this error we are glad to call it to the attention of our readers.

During its 24-year history, **The Militant** has deservedly built up a reputation for truth and accuracy. There have been very few cases of inaccuracy and in every instance we have been eager to make the necessary corrections when mistakes have been called to our attention. We do not believe in smearing the opposition with false charges no matter how vicious that opposition may be. Such smears merely confuse and becloud the real issues, thereby tending to deflect the workers from following a correct program of action.

The truth is always on the side of the working class and is an indispensable weapon in combating police terror, vigilantism and intimidation as well as every other evil of the capitalist system. Respect for the truth has been and will continue to be the policy of **The Militant**.

The Witch-Hunters Demand Blood

Federal Judge Kaufman, who sentenced Ethel and Julius Rosenberg to death in a peace-time espionage case, denied clemency to the defendants. Trying to justify himself, Judge Kaufman said that "this court has been subjected to a mounting organized campaign of vilification, abuse and pressure."

It is true that the Rosenbergs were tried in a poisonous atmosphere surpassed by few court cases in modern times. It is also true that the court was under overwhelming pressure. It was, as it remains, under the pressure of the witch-hunters, greedy for their first blood victims.

But this is not at all what Judge Kaufman was referring to. He denounced not the witch-hunters but a courageous minority which has protested the savage verdict.

The defense had filed in federal court scores of letters from scientists, educators and clergymen appealing for a more lenient sentence. And it was this that brought from Judge Kaufman his outburst about "vilification, abuse and pressure."

What must have particularly aroused the judge's ire was the letter from Dr. Harold C. Urey, world-famous nuclear scientist and Nobel prize winner. Dr. Urey, who is an authority on questions relating to the A-Bomb, studied the court transcript and concluded that the testimony of the Rosenbergs was "more believable than that of the Greenglasses," the government's chief witnesses against the Rosenbergs.

David Greenglass was sentenced to 15 years in prison. His wife, Ruth Greenglass, who admitted guilt under oath, was not even brought to trial. This disparity in sentences was correctly declared "most unjust" by Dr. Urey.

"Accepting the verdict as correct," wrote Dr. Urey, "I am amazed and completely

outraged by the unequal punishment which has been given. I believe the Rosenbergs are or have been Communists or very sympathetic to Communist ideas. I regard such people as unreliable generally, but I do not believe in punishing people unless they commit crimes."

Judge Kaufman dismissed out of hand the protests of Dr. Urey and others. But these protests should awaken those sincere defenders of civil liberties who have remained blind until now to the fact that civil liberties are indeed involved in the Rosenberg case, which, unless the verdict is reversed, will set a precedent in converting civil courts into instruments for meting out the extreme penalty.

This sinister aspect of the Rosenberg case has been deliberately played down by the capitalist press. The American Civil Liberties Union has washed its hands of the case. And sad to say, so has the organized labor movement, because of its weak and cowardly leadership.

The defense has obtained a stay in the execution date in order to appeal for presidential clemency.

Meanwhile even protests against this conversion of civil courts into death tribunals are now being pictured by the capitalist press not only as "a storm of abuse" but also as part of a "Communist plot" against the U.S.

"There is no question but that this case has been exploited by typical Communist trickery to destroy faith in American institutions," stated the Jan. 5 editorial of the N. Y. World-Telegram, key daily of the Scripps-Howard chain.

There is no question but that by taking the lives of Ethel and Julius Rosenberg the witch-hunters will have taken another giant stride toward destroying all civil liberties in this country.

THE ART OF CAMOUFLAGE

It may seem strange at first sight that a general, put into the White House the better to prepare for global conquest, might deliberately make gestures to indicate peaceful intentions.

However, Eisenhower has already indicated a certain capacity in the art of camouflage. It was the General, not the civilian Stevenson, who promised to do something about ending the war in Korea. It was the Brass Hat, candidate of the National Association of Manufacturers, not the

financial overlords and the political spokesmen all together, see these facts and these trends as well as we do.

They have but one answer. That is counter-revolution by military force. They propose to reverse the historic trend by another war. This is what they are preparing for, this is what they are trying to drag their reluctant allies into.

The satellite governments of England, France and Italy will be the allies of American imperialism in this terrible, desperate adventure of a Third World War. The thin stratum of landlords, capitalists and usurers in the backward countries will be their allies too.

But that is just about all they can count on. The majority of the people in Europe, including England, are outspokenly neutral or hostile to America. Where, then, will the troops come from? America is rich and powerful, the most productive nation in the world, with 155 million people. That is a tremendous power. But the two billion people in the world are a still bigger power.

And when you contemplate the possible or probable outcome of the war and weigh the forces and resources on each side, don't forget to count the two billion people in the world. They could be, and, in my opinion, will be, the item which tips the scales and decides the outcome.

There is no doubt whatsoever, and no one who has respect for facts can deny it, that the prospects for capitalism on an international scale, outside the United States, are bad and declining.

The prospects for nationalized economy and the further spread of radicalization and revolution are ascending. That's the state of the world as it looks from here.

But what about America itself? Capitalism is certainly supreme here, and socialism is very weak indeed. It is reduced to a virtual handful of people with a theory and conviction. What are the prospects between these two antagonists within the United States?

That, as Kipling would say, is another story, and we'll get around to it next week.

INTERNATIONAL OUTLOOK OF CAPITALIST SYSTEM

(Continued from page 2)

it at this moment — is condemned to die of anemia. It has to be put out of its misery as the precondition for the revival and development of Chinese industry and agriculture.

If one is willing to recognize reality, regardless of what his personal wishes might be, he can safely predict that China will witness the development of a nationalization program on an ever-expanding basis, bringing with it an expansion of that sector of world economy held by nationalized and planned economy, and shrinking further that section held by capitalist economy.

The Wall Street financiers who shudder at modest welfare benefits in America as a form of "creeping socialism" are, by their policy, instigating and forcing a galloping program of nationalization of industry in China, which, I repeat again, is not socialism, but the economic preparation and premises for it and the transition to it.

A third result of America's arbitrary policy of blockading China and refusing to allow other capitalist nations to trade with her, is the powerful blow it deals British capitalism. At a time when the very existence of capitalist Britain depends on an expansion of its foreign trade, America's policy in China arbitrarily drives it from the Chinese market.

Thereby they worsen the already hopeless position of British capitalism, undermine the living standards of the British workers and drive them to Bolshevism on the road to Bolshevism.

Blindly, unconsciously, but all the more surely and effectively, the masters of America are doing Lenin's work in Merry England. The disciples of Lenin, from London to Los Angeles to Shanghai, and all points in between, should recognize the extraordinary help they are getting from the leaders and masters of American capitalism, even if they feel no need to express their gratitude formally.

The Chinese revolution, America's policy toward it, and the catastrophic results of this policy, can be put down as the SIXTH AND FINAL OUTSTANDING FACT in our panoramic survey of world developments over the past half century.

Whatever side one may take in this world-wide struggle between capitalism and socialism, anyone with a respect for facts must recognize that enough important facts have been piled up in the course of world development since 1914, to indicate an unmistakable trend. That trend shows capitalist economy ridden everywhere by inevitable crisis, declining and decaying.

On the other hand, the historical trend shows the sector of nationalized economy expanding, an increasing radicalization of the workers in the crisis-ridden countries of capitalist Europe, and a veritable prairie-fire of colonial revolutions breaking out everywhere and increasing in power and intensity all the time. The masters of America, the

By Joseph Hansen

One aspect of Stalin's Christmas Eve offer to meet with Gen. Eisenhower and "cooperate in any new diplomatic approach to bring about an end to the Korean war" remains something of a mystery. Why did James B. Reston, Diplomatic Correspondent of The New York Times, put his questions to Stalin?

Many capitalist papers seem to feel that the questions and answers served no purpose but to embarrass Eisenhower. Since Stalin has utilized similar opportunities with similar results before, it might have been foreseen that the consequences of Reston's move would not differ materially this time. Why then did the capable Times correspondent provide Stalin with this fresh opening?

Franco's press in fascist Spain reasons that Stalin himself must be behind it somehow. The newspaper Ya considers it a maneuver of the Times "to undermine" the Eisenhower administration (NYT, Jan. 3), a rather strange deduction in view of the Times backing Eisenhower for President. Another Franco paper suggests that "Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, Jr., investigate James Reston, who obtained Stalin's replies, for any possible leftist affiliations."

The New Leader (Jan. 5), is not inclined to see Stalinist machinations behind Reston although this social-democratic weekly generally yields the palm to no one when it comes to smelling out red influence. The New Leader, which is much concerned about putting starch in American foreign policy, thinks it is nothing but another demonstration of the "incredible naivete" of the American press "where international politics is concerned." This opinion can be commended for its simplicity if nothing else.

ANOTHER POSSIBILITY

But a more complex possibility remains open — that Eisenhower-Dulles themselves suggested or at least approved Reston's addressing the famous questions to Stalin.

The Christian Science Monitor, which has very good diplomatic connections, suggests that this may have been the view taken by the Kremlin. "It is plausible to guess that the men in Moscow assumed there had been inspiration from the new Eisenhower team for the letter from James Reston. . . . To them it may have looked like the use of journalism as a vehicle for a pointed question." (Dec. 27.)

It is true that the Times (Dec. 26) disclaims that any one in "either the Truman or Eisenhower administration had suggested the idea, or even knew of it." A disclaimer, however, would necessarily accompany the use of this common diplomatic device. The object of using journalism in this way is to test the reaction to a move while remaining in position to officially reject it, if necessary. It is significant that Reston, who is credited with the idea of the questions, is reported to have cleared it with his superior, Arthur Krock, long recognized as an unofficial spokesman of the State Department. It seems unlikely that Krock would approve Reston's inquiry to the head of the USSR, in view of the certain, world-wide repercussions of an answer, without consulting higher authorities.

ALREADY WEIGHING IT

Be that as it may, the Alsop brothers in their column of Dec. 29 asserted that before Reston's questions were put, Dulles and Eisenhower had been weighing a meeting with Stalin. If this is true, then Reston's letter, which was answered within six days by Stalin, would fit in rather neatly as a trial balloon, serving to apprise Eisenhower and Dulles of the possible reaction to such a meeting particularly within the United States and especially within the Republican Party, which went into office damning Yalta, Teheran and Potsdam.

Would a conference between Eisenhower and Stalin, with Churchill and a representative of France sitting in, contradict the major objective of the Eisenhower regime on the international floor — that is, completion of the preparations for World War III? To answer this, we must take a look at the main course of the Truman regime in foreign policy.

TRUMAN'S POLICY

As early as 1945, the Truman administration assumed the military offensive against the Soviet Union. Beginning with the abrupt shutting off of lend-lease, it moved rapidly to weave a global network of military alliances, to encircle the Soviet bloc with military bases, to rearm Germany and Japan. Finally, with entry into the Korean conflict, it began converting the cold war into something warmer.

The Truman administration also took an openly aggressive diplomatic course, especially with enunciation of the sabre-rattling Truman Doctrine. Acheson label-

led this line "total" diplomacy, a phrase reminiscent of the "total" war of the Nazis.

But this course in the diplomatic field has been a costly one abroad, whatever the domestic "benefits" in helping to put the country on a war footing. Atom-bomb diplomacy has served to frighten the entire world and arouse unprecedented hatred of America. In the view of the capitalist classes allied to American Big Business, Truman has stumbled and fumbled from one diplomatic blunder to the next, leaving the initiative in this field in the hands of the Kremlin. Truman's success in impressing on the world the fact that Washington wants war has thoroughly disquieted Wall Street's major allies.

Thus one of the problems facing the Eisenhower administration is how to change this impression — how to appear in the international arena as the advocate and champion of peace and bring Picasso's dove home to roost in Wall Street. The logic of the international situation, consequently, calls for a turn in the diplomacy of the State Department.

DIPLOMATIC AIM

A meeting with Stalin would fit in with such a pattern. The aim would be to regain the diplomatic initiative — to try to place the onus for the war moves on the Kremlin, to try by such means to allay the critical attitude of the European bourgeoisie, and also to try to psychologize the American people into believing that the Republican general has made every effort for peace so that when the decisive moment comes for war on a major scale, the catastrophic plunge will seem inescapable.

It may turn out that Eisenhower will not be able to initiate

such a turn and that he will be forced into simple continuation of the present cut-and-dried State Department routine. If so, Wall Street will have to forego one of the advantages of putting such a powerful figure in the White House.

It appears to me, however, that the Washington correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor (Jan. 2), discussing Churchill's sudden trip to America, comes closer to the logic of the situation when he says: "The coming

Eisenhower-Churchill talks can hardly do more than cover the broad probability of a top-level talk with Stalin. But both the background of the two men and their known inclinations indicate that they are not averse to having another go with Stalin around a conference table. . . . an Eisenhower trip to Korea."

And, we can add, would mean as little in the struggle for enduring peace.

such a turn and that he will be forced into simple continuation of the present cut-and-dried State Department routine. If so, Wall Street will have to forego one of the advantages of putting such a powerful figure in the White House.

It appears to me, however, that the Washington correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor (Jan. 2), discussing Churchill's sudden trip to America, comes closer to the logic of the situation when he says: "The coming

Eisenhower-Churchill talks can hardly do more than cover the broad probability of a top-level talk with Stalin. But both the background of the two men and their known inclinations indicate that they are not averse to having another go with Stalin around a conference table. . . . an Eisenhower trip to Korea."

And, we can add, would mean as little in the struggle for enduring peace.

The American Way of Life

The Left-Hook of Jake McKenny

(As was reported here last week, Jake McKenny, a Negro carpenter, was fired from Wilson & Company's mechanical shop in Chicago in July 1951, because he knocked down Henry Baxter, a white foreman who had called him "Sunshine" and "Boy." The union, Local 25 of the CIO United Packinghouse Workers, filed a grievance and demanded McKenny's reinstatement on the ground that he had been defending his dignity as a human being against race slurs. The grievance finally came before Impartial Arbitrator Peter M. Kellner.)

The Company contended that their man Baxter was, by nature, "very jovial" and went about addressing other employees, white and Negro, with such expressions as "Sunshine" and "Boy" and had "no intention of insulting Mr. McKenny."

Insofar as the term "Boy" was concerned, the company conceded that it did have a "derogatory meaning when used in the South." But up North, they held, it was just a good old friendly expression like "pal" or "chief." UPWA pointed out that the term "Sunshine" meant to millions of Negro Americans "a person behaving like an 'Uncle Tom' and that 'Sunshine' is merely an inverted way of saying 'darker.'"

As for the term "Boy," it has a national meaning of "male servant" or a "person of childlike behavior." Both slurs had their origins in the South during pre-Civil War days and are used to set a people apart as "inferiors."

The Arbitrator summed up his decision and stated: "It is obvious that the words 'Sunshine' and 'Boy' had a far different meaning to Mr. McKenny than might have been intended by Mr. Baxter. The weight of the evidence is that Mr. McKenny had reasonable grounds for believing that these words were of a derogatory nature. . . ."

After quoting the definitions of the terms "Boy" and "Sunshine" from the American Thesaurus of Slang, the Arbitrator stated that "the evidence therefore warrants a finding that Mr. McKenny was reasonably provoked" and said:

"This Board, while not in any way condoning Mr. McKenny's assault, must recognize that certain mitigating factors did exist in this case. Mr. McKenny was employed by this Company since 1942. He held a highly skilled position. His record is entirely free of any previous incidents of this nature. He was emotionally affected by the remarks of Mr. Baxter. . . ."

In recognizing McKenny's left-hook as his blow against Jim Crow, the Arbitrator said:

"The Union Steward, in the Grievance Meeting that day, spoke of the tension that was created by the Cicero riots. The Board cannot ignore the possibility of the impact of these events on. . . McKenny's state at this time."

"The Board recognizes the need for further education in good race relations both for White and Negro employees. No previous case of this kind was cited by the parties. The White employees of this plant must understand that terms of this type must not be used in addressing Negro employees. The Negro employees must understand that if such terms are used, there are procedures set forth within the framework of this contract to obtain redress. . . ."

As to the discharge, the Arbitrator answered:

"The discharge of Jake McKenny was not for proper cause under all the circumstances of this case. The Company shall reinstate him to his former position with full seniority but without any compensation for time lost."

So ended the mystery of Jake McKenny's left-hook and the Award which marks a forward step in the fight of American workers of all races and creeds for respect and dignity.

This article is reprinted from "Action Against Jim Crow," an excellent pamphlet published by the United Packinghouse Workers of America, and obtainable for 10¢ from the UPWA Anti-Discrimination Department, 608 South Dearborn St., Chicago 5, Ill.)

BACK IN PRINT

Two Pamphlets by Leon Trotsky

WORLD UNEMPLOYMENT

This pamphlet points out how "a long-term trade agreement between the Soviet Union and the capitalist countries would be to the mutual benefit of both in that it would help to relieve unemployment in the capitalist sector and remove certain obstacles to rapid economic development in the Soviet sector." — From the Introduction by Colvin R. de Silva.

20 pages 25 cents

THE REVOLUTION IN SPAIN

25 pages 25 cents

These two important pamphlets, long out of print, have been re-issued by Lanka Samasamaja of Ceylon.

Order from
PIONEER PUBLISHERS
116 University Place New York 3, N. Y.

By George Lavan

On the evening of Dec. 30 in the New Jersey State Prison, a young man died. His weakened heart could no longer bear the terrible strain.

Twenty-seven years ago, when he was born and named Collis English, no horoscope was needed to foresee that his life would be difficult. For he was a Negro. But unforeseeable was the fact that this infant would in young manhood drain to the dregs the bitter cup of Jim Crow.

His early life was pretty much average for a Negro boy in America. He learned about "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" in school and the opposite in daily life where he was a second-class citizen and poverty-stricken to boot.

During the second great war "for democracy" he was in the Jim-Crow Navy. Off the dismal Aleutian Islands his heart was injured to the point where the Navy gave him an honorable discharge and sent him home.

Early in 1948 his path crossed that of the Trenton police. It was a bad time. The Trenton newspapers were building circulation by screaming about a crime wave. They were demanding that "the empty electric chair" be filled. The police had responded by setting up a Crime Crusher Squad. Since a recent holdup and murder was believed to have been committed by Negroes, police armed with machine guns patrolled the Negro neighborhood, stopping men on the streets, searching them and demanding their reasons for being out.

While the police were looking for Negro scapegoats to take the newspaper heat off the department, Collis English was picked up on a motor vehicle complaint.

This weak, timid lad appeared made to order for the police. They immediately accused him of the murder. Denials were useless. He was grilled continuously by teams of "not more than five policemen," who waved pistols before his face, brandished blackjacks and threatened to kill him. The police dictated his "confession" and ordered him to sign.

He was not allowed sleep. When he had heart attacks and asked for medicine and

a doctor they laughed at him. After 19 hours, terrified and faint, he was ready to sign anything to purchase some relief.

Similar methods plus the administering of hypnotic drugs produced "confessions" from four of the other Negroes haphazardly rounded up by the Trenton police. At their first trial, the Trenton Six, as they came to be known, were speedily sentenced to death.

The wonder is that Collis English's weak heart did not stop beating those days he sat in the death house. Liberal and labor forces succeeded in getting a new trial for the framed-up victims.

I watched Collis English many times during his third trial. One week he had five heart attacks — the fifth so severe that he slumped from his chair onto the floor. Even then several of the hostile courtroom attendants muttered that it was just an act to get sympathy.

After 103 days the trial ended in a compromise verdict. Four of the defendants were acquitted and Collis English and Ralph Cooper were sentenced to life imprisonment. A month ago the New Jersey Supreme Court overthrew this verdict and ordered new trials for the Trenton Two.

Surely the new trial will result in the freeing of Ralph Cooper who has now been in prison for five years for a crime to which he is linked only by color. That is, he is Negro and the criminals are also believed to have been Negro.

But what is the verdict on the death of Collis English? Does the coroner's certificate say "natural causes"? Does that cover the merciless treatment this sick lad received at the hands of the police? Does it take into account the effect of the death house? The long trials, the five years inside prison walls?

Is not a verdict needed on the Trenton newspapers that whipped up an anti-Negro hysteria? On the race-hating Trenton police? On the ambitious prosecutor who hoped to climb to the governorship on a staircase of six electrocuted, innocent bodies? Does not Collis English's death cry out for a verdict against the whole Jim-Crow system?

"Dangerously Anemic"

A new Latin-American labor federation came into being at a five-day congress held in Mexico City, November 20-25. Its initials are ATLAS, standing for Latin American Unionized Workers Association.

The control of the congress rested in the hands of the Argentine delegation and Luis Morones of the Mexican CROM. The congress' credentials committee reported that delegations from 14 countries were participating and that a number of other delegations, including Bolivia and Guatemala, were fraternal representatives or observers.

The routine of long speeches and approval of resolutions that mark labor conferences was disturbed by a few clashes. First came an attempt by Morones to deprive fraternal delegates of the right to speak. This motion was beaten after an Argentine delegate opposed it.

Later when the resolutions were being passed, fraternal delegate Mario Torres Calleja, secretary-general of the Bolivian Miners Federation, rose to point out that no resolution on the regime in Venezuela had been presented. It came out in a heated exchange that such a resolution had

been submitted but was "lost" somewhere.

Many of the resolutions passed bitterly condemned the U.S. for its policy in Puerto Rico, for its treatment of the Negro people and for its imperialism in Latin America. An overtone made by the Stalinist-dominated union federation in Mexico was brusquely rejected.

In an interview with the *Industrial Worker*, Mario Torres Calleja, head of the Bolivian delegation said the following:

"We are disposed to cooperate with all bona-fide labor organizations, but we are affiliated with none. Of the two international labor federations previously formed in Latin America, one is dominated by the U.S. State Department and the other by the Cominform. Neither commands the least respect from honest working class leaders.

"We had hoped that this new body would assert some independence, would attempt some task other than the dissemination of Argentine propaganda. Possibly it may still do so, but having been present at its birth I can say that the ATLAS, if not stillborn is dangerously anemic."

Notes from the News

SHACHTMANITE WOES are illustrated by the resignations of Irving Howe and Henry Judd from the Independent Socialist League (formerly the Workers Party) headed by Max Shachtman. The ISL Politically Committed branded the resignations, which were coupled with a declaration of support to the "West" in the impending war, a desertion from the fight for socialism. Howe branded the PC statement "Cannibalism." Also attacking the PC statement as too harsh are Emmanuel Garret and Jack Brad, leading ISL members.

OKLAHOMA'S Intercollegiate Student Senate elected a Negro officer for the first time and simultaneously asked the state legislature to review the status of Negro students in Oklahoma's universities and colleges. The 55 student delegates elected James Hill of Langston University to the vice-presidency of their organization.

SOMETHING TO HIDE? The American Newspaper Publishers Association has refused to cooperate with Sigma Delta Chi and the University of Chicago in a projected survey of the way the American newspapers cover public events.

STANLEY SYDOW, who refused to report for induction into the armed forces on the grounds that the Korean war was unconstitutional, has been denied a hearing by the U.S. Supreme Court. Sydow's case is unique in that he is the first to use arguments laid down as legal principles by the Nuremberg War Crimes Court of which U.S. Supreme Court Justice Jackson was a member.

WHERE HIS SYMPATHY LIES. President Truman granted Christmas pardons to former Congressmen Andrew May and J. Parnell Thomas. Since both have been out of prison for some time the pardons mean full restoration of citizenship rights and in Thomas' case excusing of a \$10,000 fine he never paid. Thomas, who as head of the House Un-American Activities Committee was the nation's No. 1 witch-hunter, was jailed for padding government payrolls and forcing kickbacks from employees. May, also a super-duper force-triot, was war-time head of the House Armed Forces Committee. He was convicted of taking bribes from arms manufacturers. Truman's Christmas clemency did not extend to any victims of the Smith Act or other witch-hunt laws, nor to conscientious objectors.

PENNSYLVANIA has ended Jim Crow in its National Guard.

ARMY DESERTIONS since the start of the Korean War total 46,000, the Pentagon revealed. Of these about 11,000 have not as yet been caught. According to the *N. Y. Times*, General McAuliffe, Assistant Chief of Staff for Personnel, "expressed his concern about the high rate of absences without leave occurring among men designated for shipment overseas and said that harsher treatment of such offenders had been ordered."

ST. LOUIS TEAMSTERS ended a six-week strike for a 50 cents-an-hour wage increase by taking a compromise of 30 cents. Now the Wage Stabilization Board has cut the figure to 20 cents. At a meeting of Local 600, AFL Teamsters, 1,200 members voted unanimously to fight the WSB ruling.

PENSIONS INADEQUATE was the conclusion of a survey made by the National Planning Association. It found that while nine out of ten American workers are now covered by some sort of old-age pension plan, the benefit checks that they can look forward to are not sufficient to guarantee a decent standard of life after they stop working.

SENATOR MCCARTHY'S finances have had a little light shed on them by a Senate Committee's report. While receiving a government salary of \$15,000 a year plus expense account, McCarthy banked \$172,623 in the last four years. Ray Kiernan, his administrative assistant who lives with him, banked \$96,521 in the same period, much of it in cash. As a member of the Senate Banking Committee, McCarthy had access to confidential data about the stock of the Seaboard Air Line Railroad, a line heavily in debt to the RFC, and McCarthy speculated in the stock of this company to the profit of \$25,000. With money given him to "fight communism," the darling of the red-baiters speculated in soybean futures while manipulations of the soybean market by Chinese Nationalist figures were being investigated. Here, too, McCarthy had access to confidential government reports about the market. In 1947 Pepsi-Cola Co. was lobbying for sugar decontrol. The Washington representative of Pepsi-Cola endorsed a \$20,000 note for McCarthy, who was busy attacking sugar controls.

VOLUME XVII

MONDAY, JANUARY 12, 1953

NUMBER 2

Big Business in War Cabinet



Gen. Eisenhower's Defense Sec.-designate Charles E. Wilson, former General Motors president (seated, left), meets his top aides in the Pentagon, including GM Vice Pres. Roger M. Kyes, Deputy Defense Sec.-designate (seated) and (standing, l. to r.) Army Sec.-designate Robert B. Stevens, textile manufacturer; Navy Sec.-designate Robert B. Anderson, president of Associated Refineries; and Air Sec.-designate Harold G. Talbott of Chrysler.

"SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION" URGED BY CP FOR PROGRESSIVE PARTY

(Continued from page 1)

All this, as far as it goes, sounds much like the estimate we made of the Progressive Party five years ago. In a statement to the press on Dec. 31, 1947, immediately following Henry Wallace's announcement of his third-party candidacy for U.S. President, James P. Cannon, the National Secretary of the Socialist Workers Party said: "Organized labor should boldly enter the political field with its own independent party and its own Presidential candidate and not help clutter up the field with another splinter capitalist party like the Wallace movement. . . . A Wallace party and its program cannot solve a single one of the burning problems before us today. The only force capable of averting war and . . . depression is the labor movement. It alone can effectively combat the militarization of America and the sway of political reaction. . . ." (*The Militant*, Jan. 5, 1948.)

Wallace's Progressive movement was then described in *The Militant* by George Breitman as "not a Labor Party such as the Socialist Workers Party and *The Militant* have vigorously advocated for many years . . . such a party must be an expression of the organized working class, that is, of the trade union movement, and responsible to it. That is exactly what the Wallace party is not. . . . It is a third capitalist party."

Another article in the same issue pointed out that the Stalinists, who had previously denounced SWP proposals for a Labor Party, had not experienced a "genuine conversion to independent labor politics" and that their support of Wallace's third capitalist party stemmed from "the fact that the Stalinist bureaucracy in Russia wants a deal with Truman and a third party is one of their ways of putting pressure on Truman."

PREDICTION VERIFIED

Six months before the 1948 elections, Cannon flatly predicted that Wallace, whom the Stalinists represented as the great peace hope, would betray at the first important test and that "those who mistakenly support the Wallace movement under a contrary impression will contribute, whatever their intentions, to the deception and betrayal of the people." This prediction was borne out to the hilt when Wallace jumped into the capitalist war

camp at the outbreak of the Korean war.

CHANGE IN LINE

Why do the Stalinist leaders, at this late date, feel impelled to admit so much in explaining the dismal consequences of the formation of a third capitalist party in 1948? Their resolution indicates that they want to direct the membership's efforts toward more deals with capitalist politicians and to soft-peddle third-party talk and that this is meeting some internal opposition. They state that the CP "had a rigid third party line that had no foundation in the existing alignment of forces and mass trends" and that there was a "failure" of the CP membership, who were supposed to be campaigning for the Progressive Party, "to consistently unfold a policy . . . of coalition approaches on issues and in congressional and senatorial races" — that is, they did not go far enough in backing Democratic and Republican "peace" candidates.

The Stalinist leaders claim they did attempt "to broaden the approach of the Party in the direction of a coalition policy" but "failed" because of the "resistance to such a policy." This resistance, they state, "flowed primarily from the mistakes made in the 1948 election campaign."

The facts are that in 1948 and the ensuing years they stressed the necessity of breaking with the two-party system and supporting a third party, the PP. They also backed Democrats and Republicans on occasion, but this was subordinate to their PP orientation. Now they are turning around. Their stress will be away from a third party and toward the Democratic Party and "coalition" politics.

PUT LABOR PARTY IN DISTANT FUTURE

Because of "the resistance to such a policy" which the resolution cites, however, the CP leaders feel impelled to represent their switch in policy as a move designed ultimately to build a Labor Party by putting the CP ranks and its allies in closer touch with the "masses" in the Democratic Party.

But the CP leaders put the formation of a Labor Party in the category of a vague future

Striking N.Y. Bus Drivers Put City Hall on Griddle

By Harry Ring

NEW YORK, Jan. 6 — At a huge mass demonstration in front of City Hall this afternoon, striking members of the Transport Workers Union, CIO, roared their approval of President Michael Quill's declaration: "We will strike, strike, strike, until hell freezes over!" They are fighting for the 40-hour week with no reduction in pay.

The men now work a six-day, 54-hour week, with a basic wage of \$1.66 an hour on six of the eight privately operated bus lines, and \$1.73 an hour on the other two. Time and a half is now paid after 48 hours on the six lines, and after 44 hours on the other two. They are demanding 48 hours pay for 40 hours of work, plus five hours of guaranteed overtime.

Their demand for guaranteed overtime sharply demonstrates the pressure of high living costs. Any one who has ever been packed into a New York bus during the rush hours knows that the only thing worse than paying for the privilege of "riding" in one of these gas-fuming sardine cans is the job of jockeying it through jammed-up traffic on the

company-demanded, split-minute schedules. Nothing but galloping prices could make any one look for overtime on the nerve-shattering job these men have.

FARE INCREASE SWINDLE

The companies are trying to utilize the strike as an excuse in putting over one of the most brazen swindles yet perpetrated on the long-suffering strap-hangers of this city. Conceding the 40-hour week in "principle," the operators nevertheless insist that they cannot and will not grant it unless City Hall lets them jack up fares another nickel to 15 cents.

In a series of ads, they claim that to grant the strike demands without the fare increase would make "a fair return on our property" impossible. The daily press is virtually unanimous in supporting this contention.

What are the facts? Some elementary arithmetic demonstrates that their demand for a new fare hike is grand larceny, pure and simple. The eight lines carry over three million passengers a day. A nickel increase would mean an additional income of \$160,000 a day. Taking into account the week-end slack and the possibility of some passengers having to walk to work with a 15-cent fare, this still means a minimum increased take of \$45 million a year. The *N. Y. Times*, on the basis of company figures, estimates that to meet the men's demands would cost \$8 million a year. Thus they come out of the deal with an additional yearly profit of \$37 million!

MAYOR'S ROLE

One of the principal obstacles in the path of the union has been Mayor Impellitteri, who is combining a pro-company role with the demagogic pre-election pretense of being a valiant opponent of a fare boost. He too is for the 40-hour week in "principle." But he proposes to the men that they take it with a pay cut of \$13 to \$21 a week.

In putting on this show of opposition to the demand for the fare hike, Impellitteri expresses his political sensitivity to the unanimous public hostility to a new increase. At the same time he has attempted to prove that the union leadership is in opportunistic collusion with the operators to put over the increase as a means of winning their demands. Quill's vehement and colorful denunciations of Impellitteri are not sufficient to refute this. It is incumbent upon the union leadership to take a clear and unambiguous stand for the 40-hour week without another cent of tribute to the operators. Complete opposition to the fare increase will win even wider public support to their just cause.

DOCK WORKERS RESIST RYAN ROLE IN STRIKE

NEW YORK, Jan. 6 — The strike of three locals of the International Longshoremen's Ass'n, AFL, against the American Weighmasters Ass'n is now in its fifth day, with the possibility of settlement fairly strong. The strike, which embraces some 600 men, has been sanctioned by President Joseph Ryan. His move is regarded as part of an effort to counteract the unfavorable publicity he received in the recent investigation of waterfront crime.

The men are seeking an increase of 42 cents an hour with 12 cents earmarked for the establishment of a welfare and pension fund. The contract under negotiation expired last September. The men voted to strike at that time but were dissuaded from doing so by Ryan.

The strike takes place in a setting of confused and conflicting sentiments on the part of the rest of the dock workers. Originally it appeared that Ryan intended to use the issue as a means of tying up the entire waterfront to make it appear as a demonstration of support by the membership for his administration in the face of the State Crime Commission hearings, where sensational revelations were made about the ILA's gangster-ridden leadership.

However, a resolution written in the offices of the International Longshoremen's Union currently being investigated by the New York State Crime Commission accuses the Commission of acting as a "sounding board for Communist propaganda."

NEW YORK, Jan. 7 — Settlement of the longshore strike was announced this morning. The reported agreement includes a 22-cent-an-hour increase plus 10 cents an hour for pension and welfare fund. The companies originally offered 25 cents an hour and opposed the welfare fund.

NEW YORK Marxist Labor School

1953 Winter and Spring Sessions

1. Intermediate Class on Marxism

Instructor: David Stevens

Mondays — 8 to 10 P.M. Beginning January 19

A study of selections from Marx, Engels, Lenin, Trotsky, etc., bearing on the revolutionary process in the world today.

2. Crisis of World Capitalism, Its Development and Form

Instructor: Harry Frankel

Sundays — 8 to 10 P.M. Beginning January 18

Special attention will be given to the economic crisis after the second World War and the contrasting trends of Soviet and capitalist economy.

3. Philosophy (A seminar study)

Instructor: Murray Forbes

Mondays — 8 to 10 P.M. Beginning January 19

A study of the historical basis for the evolution of human thought and an investigation of the development of idealism and materialism.

4. Marx's CAPITAL, Vol. I

Instructor: Joseph Hansen

Sundays 8 to 10 P.M. Beginning January 18

Emphasis on the Marxist method, using "Capital" as working material.

For prospectus and more information, call, write or visit

MARXIST LABOR SCHOOL
116 University Place Tel.: AL 5-7852

LOS ANGELES Friday Night Forum

"America's Road to Socialism"

A Series of 6 Lectures

Speaker:

James P. Cannon

National Secretary of the SWP

(6) "What Socialist America Will Look Like" — How a transformation of the social system will bring changes in the American way of living and working, in education, in human nature, manners and morals, incentives and rewards.

Fri., Jan. 23, 8 P.M.

FORUM HALL

1792 E. 4th St. Tel. AN 9-4953

Questions — Discussion

Refreshments

Tuition: 35 cents.

Newark Fri. Night Socialist Forum

presents a talk on

The Meaning of Bevanism

Speaker:

Michael Bartell

Fri., Jan. 16, 8:30 P.M.

at 52 Market Street

Get the Facts

Victor Serge's graphic story of Stalin's usurpation of power

"From Lenin to Stalin"

112 pages \$50

Pioneer Publishers

116 University Place

New York 3, N. Y.

NEW YORK Friday Night Socialist Forum

How Many Gains Have Negroes Made?

Speaker:

George Breitman

Fri., Jan. 16, 8 P.M.

Militant Hall

116 University Place (Near Union Square)

Questions, Discussion

Refreshments

Contribution 25 cents