

Union Heads Aid Imperialism In "Great Debate"

By The Editors

American labor leaders have been obliged to participate in the "Great Debate" over U.S. foreign policy. The breakdown of public confidence in the Truman-Acheson course has made the representatives of 16 million workers offer some answers to these pressing questions: What is really happening in Asia? What should the American workers' attitude be toward colonial upheavals?

Richard Deverall, AFL representative to the Free Trade Union Committee in Asia, has made the first serious attempt to explain events. His article in the December American Federationist entitled "Asia's Revolution" recognizes several facts:

1. Deverall admits a genuine revolution is going on in Asia, not simply a Big Power conflict. "A veritable revolution has in successive stages swept the vast area of Asia...comprehending over half the world's population."

The Two American Revolutions

2. Deverall says that this Asian revolution resembles in many respects the two American revolutions. "We find a vast area of the world that is now embarking on the adventure that was America's after 1776. Asia seeks to break the hold of colonial chains." This is undeniable.

3. The AFL spokesman then draws a parallel between the Asian events and the American Civil War: "The slave labor system of the South was fought by the early unions of the first half of the last century, for free American labor then as now knew that labor could never achieve its human dignity half slave and half free."

4. He amplifies this by pointing out the semi-slave plantation conditions which the Asian masses are struggling to abolish: "The tragic war between the states legally ended slavery in the U.S. and at the same time pushed the American people along the road to industrialization."

All these points are true. The Asian masses must clear away both the colonial domination and the native feudal landlord system. "The path of the American workers has blazed the way for our Asian brothers," Deverall concludes.

The Course of the Labor Leaders

On the basis of these facts it would seem that the American labor leaders should wholeheartedly support Asia's revolution. But they follow a very different course. While they recognize the Asian revolution in words, they serve as recruiting sergeants for its greatest enemy, U.S. imperialism! They even complain because they are not being used enough. The CIO Executive Board recently called for "immediate steps to provide adequate CIO representation in the Department of State."

To persuade American workers to support U.S. imperialism, Deverall represents the great liberating movements of Asia as mere machinations of the Kremlin. "The problem today, however, is that while the democratic revolution in North America was able to develop sufficiently to defend itself from external aggression, unhappily the newly liberated countries of Asia are being subverted from within by the Communists...Free Americans will not tolerate (Stalin's) choking to death of the democratic revolutions of Asia," he says.

But it is not Stalin's army that is today killing Asian revolutionists. It is the army of American imperialism. The Chinese armies fight with amazing courage behind their present leadership. If that leadership — or Stalin — tries to "choke" the revolution, the Chinese masses will take care of them in their own way.

The Truth About Asia

Stalin's manipulation is not the main problem. In our Revolutionary War the British rulers tried to smear the American independence struggle as a "Bourbon Plot" because the revolutionary forces were aided by the French monarchy, which, for its own dynastic reasons, sent its navy, officers and gold. The American fighters for independence gladly accepted this aid. That did not divert the American Revolution.

Also, in the Civil War, the Russian Czar sent warships to help Lincoln, while Britain and France aided the Confederacy. Washington and Lincoln in fact received more aid from foreign governments than the Chinese or Korean peoples have received from the Kremlin. An alliance between China and the USSR does not change the progressive character of the Chinese struggle for national independence.

The Asian revolution today is similar to 1776 because it is being fought for independence, and it resembles 1861 in its struggle for unity and democracy. The American people clashed with British Colonialism and Southern Landlordism. The Asian people are fighting for democratic and socialist aims against capitalist reaction spearheaded by U.S. Big Business.

The Asian peoples, fighting for the same aims as we did in our revolutions, deserve the sympathy and support of all labor. Let us not forget that inspiring chapter in history when British labor during our Civil War demonstrated against British imperial intervention on the side of the South and helped save the Union.

The great questions before American labor are: Where is progress and where is reaction — and which side deserves support? The outcome of this debate, now going on within the labor movement, is more decisive than the "Great Debate" among the imperialist rulers.

Why Are They Lying About Korea Battles?

Censorship Seeks To Hide GI Plight

Are the American people being told the truth about the military situation in Korea? Or are they being maliciously kept misinformed?

Surely it is time to ask questions like these when a conservative capitalist politician such as Senator Taft publicly expresses his lack of confidence "in the judgement of many top military leaders" of the Pentagon. Taft wouldn't have issued a statement like that unless he knew a lot more than the rest of the American public have been permitted to know.

An "absolute censorship" has now been clamped on all news from Korea. No reporters are henceforth permitted to talk of retreats, only of "withdrawals." MacArthur's censors significantly single out the ban on all "comments indicating a low morale or poor efficiency on the part of UN troops." Just what are they trying to hide? Is it perhaps the military hopelessness of the situation?

UNTRUE ESTIMATES

Let us recall that not a single one of the previous military estimates either from MacArthur in Tokyo or from Truman down in Washington, has thus far turned out true.

If Truman began by boasting of a "police action," then only the other day Defense Secretary Marshall issued an assurance the war in Korea was developing "almost exactly" as "the U.S. High Command anticipated." In between there has been one reckless claim after another from MacArthur up to and including his "home-by-Christmas" offensive.

Who has the right to know the truth — and the whole truth — about what is happening in Korea, if not the American people? By their past and present conduct, neither the administration nor its military spokesmen merit an ounce of confidence. They are obviously doing everything in their power to foil the will of the people, who in their big majority WANT THE TROOPS BROUGHT BACK HOME!

Next Week

"Stalinism in the World Crisis"

European view:


By Pablo

Asian analysis:

By Dr. Colvin deSilva

Stalinism in the U. S.

Truman Scorns Appeal By Public to Stop War



Eisenhower's Statement Takes Shine off Brass

Slick propaganda has created a popular image of Gen. Eisenhower as a genial, folksy, "regular fellow" — a scholar and educator rather than the usual professional militarist. But just before he left for Europe, in reply to reporters' questions, he blurted out views that reveal him as a typical specimen of the arrogant, reactionary officer caste. His statement takes a good bit of shine off the brass.

NOMINAL PAY

He said that "limited service" men — those who enter the army without intending to make it a life-time career — should get only "nominal pay." This goes also "if you enter any kind of factory or governmental service." A war plant worker or government clerk would say "only one thing, 'Can I serve my country well? If I can, here I am.'"

Two years ago, as temporary chairman of the Joint Chiefs of

Staff, Eisenhower proposed \$10 a month for "limited service" men — that is, the average GI.

For the foot-slogging, fighting and dying GI, "as far as pay is concerned you don't pay a person to go to school. You don't pay a person to work out his poll taxes." That, he said, "is an obligation to the state."

But, he told the reporters, he has a different standard for those who make a career out of mass murder. "I believe," he said, "there are certain professional cadres that must always be remunerated along professional lines, because they make a life career of it."

RANK AND FILE

That's not the view of the ranks, however. Typical enlistees at one Army and Air Force Recruiting Station in New York City, questioned by a N. Y. Herald-Tribune reporter the day

after Eisenhower's statement, expressed "a sharp reaction, unanimously critical."

"We're going over there and dodge bullets for a few dollars a month?," said one, whose "opinion was seconded by those around him." Another exclaimed, "When we get a pass, we couldn't even get home. We'd have to walk." A third said, "You go to school for a definite reason. It's your own prerogative. There's no choice in this." Still another snorted, "If you go into the Army, what do you get out of it? You come out even dumber." One protested, "We need something to get started with when we get out. What Ike suggests would leave us flat."

In "spontaneous indignation" the enlistees made a round of "rash replies," says the story, until one of the youth told the reporter, "If you print that, you'll land in jail."

People Will Be Taxed "Until It Hurts," President States

With brutal contempt for the will of the American people, Truman's "State of the Union" message to Congress ignored the great popular demand that overshadows every other today: Stop the war now and withdraw the U.S. troops from Korea!

He did not offer even the courtesy of a reference to the flood of letters to the White House, Congress and the press voicing overwhelming public sentiment to "save our boys" from the disastrous consequences of his "police action" — his undeclared Korean war. Instead, he made it clear he intends to risk utter disaster for the GIs in Korea.

He evaded entirely, furthermore, the fundamental Constitutional issue that has been raised in the "Great Debate" on foreign policy: His conduct of war without consultation of Congress, let alone the consent of the people. Shall a single man, as Truman did in the case of Korea and as he clearly plans to do with relation to China and Western Europe, commit this country to war or engage armed forces on foreign soil wherever and whenever he sees fit? That is one of the most crucial questions on which the American people expected Truman to speak. But he disdained to answer it.

FULL SCALE WAR

Instead, he presented us with the appalling prospect of ever-increasing and accelerated preparations for "full war mobilization" and a "full-scale war." And though he did not dare to spell out the details, he indicated a future of growing scarcity, higher prices, heavier taxes, frozen wages — the austerity of a gar-

Mothers Protest 18-Year Draft

Mothers in Wehatchee, Wash., have started a "chain" telephone campaign to block the move by Truman's Defense Department to draft 18-year-olds into the armed forces.

They have organized to call their friends and relatives by phone and urge them to protest to their Senators and Representatives against Congressional authorization of the proposed draft. They also ask those they phone to make a dozen or more similar calls to "spread the word."

One housewife is reported to have made at least fifty phone calls in the first day of the campaign.

Truman was silent about the terrible plight of the American troops in Korea, which is being concealed by MacArthur's censorship. He represented the fighting there as a battle "for our lives and our liberties." He did not tell the American people that he had ordered an invasion of Korea to intervene on the side of the U.S.-sponsored executioner's regime of Syngman Rhee in a civil war waged by the Korean peasants and workers against the Rhee despotism.

He did not tell of the more than a million civilian casualties in Korea about whom Charles

(Continued on page 3)

TAFT TRIES TO NARROW FOREIGN POLICY RIFT

By John G. Wright

Senator Taft, the Republican opposition's "man of power" in the 82nd Congress, touched off the "Big Debate" officially by his Jan. 5 speech. Taft is notorious in political

circles for his bull-headedness — "an isolated phenomenon who doesn't sit with anybody," as one wit put it. The pro-administration press has given the public the misleading impression that Taft's views diverge widely from Truman's. Actually they incline far more toward the administration than to Hoover.

But the pro-administration tub-thumpers Democrat and Republican alike, jumped on Taft, just as they did on Hoover. Leading the pack, the N. Y. Times editors denounced Taft as a political "Typhoid Mary" of our day, the spreader of the most malignant "spiritual malady," to wit, defeatism.

More restrained the N. Y. Herald-Tribune editors told Taft that he was a fool to "prejudice" (read: render more difficult) General of the Army Eisenhower's job in Europe by his sharp attack on Truman. But they at least took note, in passing, that Taft was consciously trying to "narrow the arena of debate on national strategy."

POLITICAL GIST

Leaving aside for the moment Taft's "full-dress attack" on the administration's course, the political gist of his speech was summarized by J. C. Harsch, political reporter of the Christian Science Monitor:

Taft "now stands as near the administration's foreign policy as a Republican could and retain his partisan respectability," applying his own "various rules and precepts in such a way that amounts almost to what the administration actually is doing in foreign policy," correctly points out Harsch.

In fact, in many important instances Taft goes beyond the ad-

ministration. As Taft himself said, in his comments before the National Press Club, his own position is more properly liable to attack as imperialist, rather than as "isolationist."

For example, while talking against sending U.S. troops abroad, he not only recognizes "U.S. responsibilities" as the occupying power in Germany, but cited places for the use of land troops which the Trumanites have not dared as yet even mention such as: North Africa, Malaya and Suez.

So far as air and naval "aid" is concerned, Taft is ready to go the whole hog. Aid must be extended to "any island nations which desire our help." Included here are Formosa, Japan, Philippines, Indonesia, Australia and New Zealand.

TACTICAL DIFFERENCE

Taft has no objections whatever to committing U. S. divisions to "work with" the Europeans "in the general spirit of the Atlantic Pact." He simply wants the number "limited" in advance; a tactical difference and nothing more. He doesn't even want the troops brought back from Korea right away, but only when it proves militarily impossible to maintain them.

On China, Taft goes much beyond the administration. Here he joins the infamous China Lobby. Taft, it is true, opposes sending U.S. troops to the mainland, but favors all-out aid to Chiang to enable this mortal enemy of the Chinese people to resume operations on China's mainland.

For several weeks now large-scale arms shipments to Formosa

(Continued on page 3)

A Voice from Stalin's Prison-camp

By Suzanne Leonhard

Thousands, tens of thousands of genuine Soviet Trotskyists have died in Stalin's jails, slaughter pens and forced labor camps. They never surrendered to the Stalinist bureaucracy and their fate has been kept hidden from the world. It is one of the Kremlin's most jealously guarded "state-secrets."

One of them was a girl, Yelena Ginsburg. About her fate we know thanks to Suzanne Leonhard, an old militant of the Spartacus Bund in Germany and a personal friend of Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht. Suzanne Leonhard had to flee Hitler's Germany because of her underground Communist activities. On the advice of Alexandra Kollontai, then Soviet Ambassador to Sweden, she sought refuge in the USSR.

In October 1936 Stalin's secret police (then the NKVD) arrested her. She spent ten years in Stalin's forced labor camps. Since her liberation and residence in Western Germany, she has written a book on her experiences in these camps, entitled: "One Quarter of My Life." Although not a member of the Trotskyist movement, she has permitted the publication of the following chapter from her book, so that the world might for the first time learn from an eye-witness what fate befalls the Soviet Trotskyists. — Ed.

She was then 24 or 25 years old. And her name was Yelena Ginsburg. I met her in the Shor hospital near Tibizhu during the summer of 1937. This hospital, administratively, did not belong to the reception camp at Shor, but to the "Shel-Dor-Lag," that is, the network of the large camps whose prisoners had to construct the railroad from Kotlas to Vorkuta.

During the construction of this railroad, many thousands of

Smirnov who was condemned to death and executed on the occasion of the first great Moscow (frame-up) trial in 1936, Yelena Ginsburg, and myself, Yelena, or Lola, as she was called, attracted my attention as soon as we became acquainted. She was not pretty, her features were irregular, and she even squinted a little; but her eyes flamed with the fire of those who struggle for a supreme consciousness, who are ready to sacrifice themselves for their cause and fanatically pursue the goal to which they have dedicated their lives. The strength of Lola's conviction and her political seriousness could not fail to influence me; from my early youth I have myself passionately striven for truth, and I have always fought for my ideas, even though my wings no longer carry me as far as in the old days.

Yelena Ginsburg was in the hospital following a hunger-strike which lasted two weeks, but proved ineffective because of forced feeding. Lola still felt rather weak, but she no longer had to remain in bed. As I could get up myself for several hours and had medical permission to get fresh air, we were able to go for walks during which we could converse freely and without witnesses. My limited knowledge of the Russian language was not adequate at all for political discussions, but Lola had some acquaintance with French and German.

THE SHADOW OF MISERY

I induced her to tell me her life. Her father had been a small Jewish itinerant peddler before the revolution, and later became a construction worker. Lola was the oldest of seven children. She had no recollection of pre-revolutionary times. Her entire childhood was spent in the shadow of infinite misery, which did not recede after the October Revolution of 1917. But unlike her parents who were illiterate, Lola managed to enter school after the revolution.

During the first post-revolutionary decade, the general level of Soviet education remained very low. There was a dearth of instructors and school-room equipment; there were few buildings; it was impossible to obtain books or writing paper; there was often not enough coal to heat the schools; children often could not attend for lack of shoes and coats, or because they had to help out at home, or because they were undernourished.

Lola, however, let nothing stand in the way of her enthusiasm and passion for study. She walked to school barefooted, or coatless, or without having eaten. All that mattered was to be able to learn! A woman teacher took pity on her, gave her some books and taught her languages. Her parents did not approve of their eldest child's preoccupation with books. They overworked her with domestic chores. Lola found a solution to this difficulty. She got up early in the morning, took care of the younger children, worked with her father after school, stood in the bread-line for hours with a book in her hands, and continued to read or study late into the night, thanks to a small oil-lamp which her teacher filled with fuel.

Lola became a member of the Komsomol, (the Russian Young Communist League) and obtained a job with the secretariat of the Komsomol at the end of her studies. She was happy with her education and had no inkling of its inadequacy. She was proud of her knowledge which, she thought, could not only conquer but also improve the world. Lola earned more than her father and mother together, who were unskilled laborers, but the young Communist girl kept not a single kopek for herself. Did not six

children have to be fed and sent to school?

LOLA JOINS TROTSKYISTS

The struggles between factions in the Russian Communist Party during Lenin's illness and after his death; the Fourteenth Party Congress with its decisive political discussions; the Fifteenth Congress where the entire opposition was expelled from the party; and finally Trotsky's exile to Alma-Ata; all these steps of Stalin's road to autocratic rule and infallibility, had not been consciously lived through as contemporary history by Lola. She gave herself body and soul to the task of building socialism in the world's only workers' state.

It was only during the years 1929-30, when the question of the forced "wholesale collectivization" of agriculture became the issue of the day, that the young Communist girl, then 17 years of age, began to think independently and critically about fundamental political problems. After serious inner struggles, she decided to join the Trotskyist Opposition. As an opponent of Stalin, she was arrested as early as 1934.

The political penitentiary at Verkhn-Uralsk where she served her sentence, became her political

(Continued on Page 2)

A Trotskyist Voice From Stalin's Prison-camp

(Continued from Page 1)

university. In this prison she met the political opposition groups of all tendencies and shades. If her descriptions are trustworthy, the regime was then still very liberal in that prison. The political prisoners had access to a well-stocked library and could discuss freely among themselves. We can easily imagine what heated political discussions must have taken place!

MARXIST KNOWLEDGE

As a result of her two years' stay in this political penitentiary, Lola Ginsburg acquired a solid Marxist training and a thorough knowledge of the international labor movement and the history of political movements. Her knowledge surprised me again and again. Many details of the history of the Russian Communist Party and its evolution into the State party of the Soviet Union were made clear to me by Yelena Ginsburg, because I had studied these problems superficially and without method while I was abroad. Lola Ginsburg had become acquainted with the militant Trotskyist, Vladimir Smirnov, in Verkhni-Uralsk. An intimate political and personal friendship had grown between the two, and Lola married him in prison.

In 1937 the wave of arrests took on unheard-of dimensions and hundreds of thousands of political prisoners were sent to forced labor camps. Most of the prisoners at the political penitentiary at Verkhni-Uralsk were sent to far-away regions. Vladimir Smirnov received assurances that he would be interned together with his wife in a camp beyond the polar circle. But they were separated a few days after the transport. During the night Smirnov was sent to the camp of Vorkuta. Lola arrived during the next days in Tibizhu. They had not been allowed to bid each other farewell, or to share their mutual possessions; part of Smir-

nov's belongings were left with Lola in the women's tent.

Lola protested by means of a hunger-strike, and bombarded the camp administration with requests in which she explicitly spoke of herself as "the Trotskyist prisoner Yelena Ginsburg." To appreciate her action, it is necessary to realize that Trotskyism was the most terrible and nefarious crime. A thief, an embezzler, a bandit or even a murderer was considered a person of quality in the camp as compared with any political prisoner; but a "counter-revolutionary agitator" or one "accused of espionage" was judged relatively innocent as compared with a "Trotskyist." All those whose conviction documents were marked with the fatal letter T attempted to keep it hidden as closely as they could.

But Lola described herself proudly as Trotskyist even in official correspondence, when no one asked for it and when it would have sufficed to sign her letters "prisoner so and so." In this way she delivered herself gratuitously to her executioners. This can be taken as evidence of a lack of political maturity and great innocence; but the smile disappeared from my lips when I saw the sacred fire in Lola's eyes. Not only was I moved by the power of her convictions, but I had to admire her.

STUDIED LITERATURE

In the hospital, Lola's thirst for knowledge was greater than ever. It made her happy to refresh and enrich her linguistic knowledge with my help. She had somewhere obtained a history of French literature but the work had been written for one who was self-taught, and Lola soon realized that it assumed a more basic knowledge than she could claim. We began to read it together. Lola was happy that I could answer many of her questions. I gave her a detailed account of the contents of many classics and described their character, style

and the epochs which had given them birth. I acquainted her with the tragedies of Corneille and Racine; retold Victor Hugo's Les Misérables, Flaubert's Madame Bovary, Anatole France's Crainquebille, and Edmond Rostand's drama Cyrano de Bergerac, which I remembered well from my studies at the lycee.

The study of this brief history of literature made Lola realize to what extent her knowledge of Western writing was limited. She had read nothing of Balzac or Zola, Voltaire or Rousseau, La Fontaine or Boileau. Of the whole of French literature she had a vague knowledge only of Guy de Maupassant and Romain Rolland. She did not even know the names of contemporary authors. The penitentiary library contained but few translations from foreign literature. When we read a summary of one of Moliere's comedies in which the details of a feast are described, Lola suddenly said with a far-away and child-like tone in her voice: "Roast? I have never eaten roast food in my life. . ."

BURNING QUESTIONS

Our political discussions were not carried on in the hospital itself. They ranged over all the burning questions of the "permanent revolution," "socialism in one country," "spontaneity of the masses," etc. Lola did not trust our room-mate Smirnova. We walked in the garden or in the forest nearby which was part of the camp's zone.

Lola's knowledge of languages often proved inadequate and our discussions would have reached an impasse if the engineer Edelsohn, a 78-year old man well-versed in languages, had not graciously offered his services as interpreter. He liked to join us and translated Lola's heated speeches for me from the Russian. Old Edelsohn had been in the camp twelve years. He had come from Baku where he had been a commercial engineer in the oil industry. He had traveled a great



deal in his youth, knew almost the entire world, Italy, Germany, France, Spain, England, the United States, and spoke four European languages fluently, in addition to Russian. He loved to converse with me in French, German or English. We exchanged reminiscences of Paris and Vienna, the Alps and the Cote d'Azur.

Politically, Lola and I were far removed from the old engineer. He represented a world which had vanished and considered us at best as two "poor foolish girls."

This did not prevent him from being humanly very close to us and taking great pity on us, who had become, although for a cause opposed to his own, victims of the regime he detested.

Lola, the militant Trotskyist, dreamed of being indicted in a great political trial. She wanted on such an occasion to tell the truth to the world. She wished to cry out to the world the real aims of Trotskyism, so miserably slandered and calumniated by Stalin. She wished to demonstrate clearly that the road of Trotsky

was the road of world revolution, the only genuine road to Communism in the USSR and Europe, whereas the road of Stalin represented the shameful betrayal of the teachings of Marx.

Her speech accusing Stalin, burning with faithfulness to her doctrine and passion for her convictions, had long since been prepared in detail by Lola. She lacked only an opportunity to deliver it before an attentive world opinion. After clarifying for the Communists of the whole world the true aims of Trotskyism and the reasons for the Trotskyist struggle against Stalin, she was prepared to die. She knew that her actions would certainly entail death. She did not underestimate the unlimited power of Stalin and the NKVD. But she hoped that her last words might bring thousands of new militants back into the political arena.

THE REVOLUTIONARY SPIRIT

To die a martyr's death for the cause of Trotskyism, that was young Lola's life-dream. It was then that I began to understand the enthusiasm with which she had followed my account of Karl Liebknecht's anti-war agitation, the passion with which she had listened again and again to the description of our Spartacist uprising and our struggles on the barricades of Germany. There was the revolutionary spirit she knew so well! But was such activity still possible in the Soviet Union? Lola refused to admit the existence of a police-regime so perfected that any martyrdom became impossible. "She flies toward death as a moth toward a flame," old man Edelsohn kept telling me, shaking his head. And this is what finally happened.

In September 1937 we learned that we would have to leave the hospital within a few days, as our convoy was leaving for its final destination — Kochmess. Yelena

Ginsburg started a new hunger-strike. She was waiting for an answer to her requests and refused to leave the hospital. The doctor, a good man by the name of Kukinadze who spoke German well, took me aside and asked what he could do for me. Perhaps I would also prefer to remain in the hospital. As a doctor, he could oppose my departure. I thanked him warmly for this token of humanity but decided to depart for the unknown.

Sooner or later we would get beyond the polar circle, anyway; what difference did it make whether that would be a few weeks earlier or later, I said to myself.

"Never have I taken so much pity on any hospital prisoners as on you two," sighed Kukinadze. "It is difficult enough for Russian intellectuals to live in such conditions. How much more difficult must it be for you who possess European culture — and as I have been to Germany myself, I know what that means — and for this unhappy and fanatic child, Yelena Mihailovna. It breaks my heart. Tomorrow I must resume the forced feedings. I have received orders from my superiors."

The day before my departure I went once more to Lola's bedside to bid her farewell. Her lips were swollen with fever, she felt very weak, although she had been forcibly fed for several days. "Suzanne, open my trunk, I want to give you a warm piece of clothing; you cannot leave as you are now dressed; you will die of cold," she whispered. She calmed down only after I had accepted a warm suit of brown material. It was almost new and had belonged to Vladimir Smirnov. Lola also gave me some underwear, socks and handkerchiefs which had belonged to him. "They are men's things," she smiled, "but it is better than nothing. I know that we are separated forever. I will

never see my husband again and I can't send him these things. I'd rather give them to you than have them for that gang of GPU bandits." Deeply moved, I bade Lola farewell.

THE EXECUTION

Two years later I learned that Lola Ginsburg had been shot at Shor during the winter of 1937. With her were a dozen victims of NKVD terror, doctor Kukinadze, the male nurse Noack, a woman nurse, a Polish comrade who had worked in the clothing department, and the camp commander at Shor. "The entire Trotskyist nest was exterminated," said one of the soldiers of the Okhrana. The execution was mentioned nowhere, and for a long time nobody knew where the victims had been sent, until the truth came out. It is possible that the victims themselves did not know that they would be shot when they were taken to the forest. Sophie Schol, a young Munich student who had led an anti-Nazi resistance group at the University and was shot in 1944, managed, from the very top of the Nazi gallows, to cry out words which echo to this day in the hearts of hundreds of men and inspire them to fight totalitarianism. The absolutism of the Czarist regime could not prevent the words that the courageous Sonya Peronskaya spoke when she was led to her execution from being transmitted to her contemporaries and encouraging them in their struggle against tyranny.

Stalin's terror alone makes martyrdom impossible. The opposition youth of the USSR became the target of the NKVD bullets, and the survivors had no news of it. This is why I am happy to be able to tell the life and death of Lola Ginsburg. May her heroic story, symbol of thousands of brave fighters for the world communist revolution, not have been in vain.

Yugoslavia Seen With Open Eyes: 11

Permanent Revolution -- Practice and Theory

By Ernest Germain

In Yugoslavia the whole course of degeneration of the Russian Revolution is unwinding itself again, but in a reverse sense. Under the pressure of the mighty mass movement, the leadership of the CPY broke with the practice of class collaboration, abolishing the bourgeois order, laid the foundations for a workers state and for the construction of socialist economy. This policy brought the CPY into irreconcilable conflict with the counter-revolutionary encroachments of the Soviet bureaucracy. When this conflict broke out into the open, the leadership of the CP started to revise and do away with bureaucratic Stalinist practices in every field of social activity. The Yugoslav leaders understood empirically that it was impossible to protect the conquests of the revolution against both the dangers of bourgeois restoration and of bureaucratic degeneration without extending quickly, and as broadly as possible, workers' democracy inside the country, along with the active and conscious participation of the masses in the administration of the state and the economy. This understanding came as a result of the experience of the revolutionary cadres of Yugoslavia.

LENINIST THEORY

It grew deeper in the course of the faction fight, in which the reactionary, conservative and bureaucratic faction, expressing the pressure of the Soviet bureaucracy and the bureaucratic elements inside Yugoslavia, was fortunately defeated. This empirical understanding was followed up by an attempt to reconstruct Leninist theory, namely, to unite into a comprehensive theoretical system the conclusions of all the practical measures already undertaken by the CPY, against the Kremlin and against the native bureaucratic elements.

The unfolding of this process, the reverse of what had happened in the Soviet Union between 1923 and 1927, is of ex-

treme historical importance for the future of the revolutionary mass movement. It strikingly confirms Marx's brilliant predictions about the proletarian revolutions which "came back to the apparently accomplished in order to recommence it afresh," correcting "the inadequacies, weaknesses and paltriness of their first attempts." (The Eighteenth Brumaire, page 17.)

It confirms the correctness of the whole line of struggle of the Left Opposition headed by Leon Trotsky in the USSR, for what they fought against in the Soviet Union, the Yugoslav CP is fighting against today in Yugoslavia; what they said should be done in the USSR, the CPY is trying to do today in Yugoslavia.

NEW REVOLUTION

To all the skeptics and pessimists, to all the revisionists and those who wanted to blot out the revolutionary possibilities of the proletariat with their own spleen, the Yugoslav events have given a striking and definitive answer: YES, IT IS POSSIBLE FOR A VICTORIOUS PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION TO STRUGGLE AGAINST ITS OWN BUREAUCRACY, EVEN IN A SMALL AND BACKWARD COUNTRY YES, EACH NEW PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION WILL CORRECT THE MISTAKES AND PALTRINESSES OF THOSE THAT WENT BEFORE, AND A I S E REVOLUTIONARY PRACTICE TO A HIGHER LEVEL. YES, THE FUTURE BELONGS TO THE REVOLUTIONARY MASSES, TO THE REAL COMMUNIST REVOLUTION WHICH WITHIN A BRIEF SPAN WILL ACHIEVE IMMEASURABLE PROGRESS IN ADVANCED COUNTRIES, AS COMPARED WITH WHAT IS REALIZED TODAY IN YUGOSLAVIA AND COULDN'T EVEN BE REALIZED IN RUSSIA.

Whatever may be the future course of the Yugoslav revolution, however tense its tragic contradictions today, this lesson

to the revolutionists and advanced workers of all countries is already an indelible fact, written into the history of the last two years. To the bold and single-minded Communist workers of Yugoslavia, who have for a decade endured countless sacrifices to make that lesson possible, revolutionists of all countries owe admiration and gratitude.

Nevertheless, in Yugoslavia the process which is the reverse of

This installment concludes the brilliant series of articles on the Yugoslav Revolution by Ernest Germain, the weekly publication of which was begun by The Militant on Nov. 6, 1950. Any reader who has not read all installments may get back issues by writing to The Militant, 116 University Place, New York 3, N. Y. — Ed.

the degeneration of the proletarian revolution, has gone much farther in the domain of practice than in the field of theory. This is nothing which should surprise us. Tradition, said Friedrich Engels, is the greatest conservative force in history. Having been reared and educated in Marxist ideas, it is not surprising that leaders of the Thermidorian bureaucratic reaction against the Russian revolution inaugurated that same reaction by lengthy and fraudulent interpretations of the writings of the greatest of all revolutionists, Lenin. In the same way, having been nourished and brought up by the theories, the prejudices and the sentiments of the international Stalinist movement, there is nothing really surprising in this, that the leadership of the CPY still clings to many theories of Stalinist reaction, while building in practice the democratic basis of the Yugoslav revolution. Only people who have never grasped dialectics can believe there is a synchronized and identical ("one to one") correspondence between the dynamics of human actions and existence and the progress of human ideas.

The theoretical progress of the CPY is still far from being rounded and all-sided, far from having arrived at a complete re-

construction of the Leninist conception of world revolution in the epoch of world Imperialism. There are still many holes in their present theoretical analysis still many sides undeveloped or altogether lacking. Their own revolutionary experiences are only partly generalized, or given theoretical formulation by themselves. They showed in practice that it is impossible to achieve national liberation without at the same time realizing the social revolution. But the leaders of the CPY still hesitate to formulate this first tenet of Trotsky's theory of the permanent revolution in the form of a general law applicable to all retarded colonial and semi-colonial countries.

While they today practice and themselves explain that following the conquest of power, the revolution, far from definitively coming to an end, only really begins, and will go on and on, toward the establishment of workers' democracy, toward the development of Socialist economy toward the next stage of socialism and the withering away of the state — the leaders of the CPY still hesitate to formulate this second element of Trotsky's theory of the permanent revolution, in the form of a general law.

This empirical and pragmatic lag of their ideological evolution has in turn prevented them from comprehending the third element of Trotsky's theory of the permanent revolution, namely: that victorious proletarian revolution in one country, while acting to consolidate its positions by beginning the foundations for the construction of the socialist economy, has to orient its policy in the first place by the interests of the international development of the proletarian revolution. Only such a development could definitively consolidate the conquests of the Yugoslav revolution in the epoch of world imperialism. Finally, the existing relationship of forces on the international field, and the foreign reactionary pressure brought to bear on Yugoslavia, make it increasingly difficult for the leaders of the CPY to grasp in all its consequences and conclusions

the theory of permanent revolution, and the rounded Leninist program for the international working class.

NOT YET UNFOLDED

The tremendously progressive process of democratization of the Yugoslav revolution has likewise not yet unfolded to its ultimate conclusions. Whereas under the present circumstances little can be added in the field of economy and in the state apparatus that is not the conscious goal of the Yugoslav Communists in the coming months and years — for instance, plans to allow two slates of candidates at the next legislative elections are being today openly discussed among Communist cadres in Yugoslavia — inner party democracy, while having taken many steps forward as compared with the pre-1948 period, is still far from having arrived at the level or pattern of the Russian Bolshevik Party in the period of 1917-1923. Of course, this too is not surprising. The Russian Stalinists started to strangle internal democracy in side a revolutionary party which had one of the most democratic traditions in the whole history of the international labor movement. No wonder it took them a relatively long time to destroy that mighty instrument of the proletarian revolution and of proletarian power! The Yugoslav Communists on the contrary started out with a party which had only a record of fierce factionalism and Stalinist monolithism. Their party has never known at all what genuine proletarian democracy is like! Who can wonder in these circumstances that progress in democratizing the inner-party regime is slow? Small wonder that freedom of discussion has unquestionably been restored, temporary tendencies are still forbidden, no groupings appear at conferences or in party meetings, and even in the minds of the Yugoslav leaders tendencies are still confused with party-wrecking factions.

On all these matters, it is the duty of revolutionists of foreign countries to try to correct through criticism in a friendly, fraternal and constructive way the errors and shortcomings of the Yugoslav Communists. A living revolution, forging ahead amidst tremendous obstacles and against powerful enemies, has no reason whatever to be afraid of such criticism by the international labor movement. Quite the contrary. The most valuable contribution it can receive today for its own benefit is precisely such criticism. The terrible aftermath of the Russian Revolution holds a tragic lesson

for Yugoslav revolutionists. Critical friends and supporters within the international labor movement are to be preferred a thousand times to uncritical "admirers" and flatterers, who only want to live at the expense of the revolution, and not to fight for its consolidation and expansion!

CRITICAL SUPPORT

There is not a moment's inclination among Trotskyist revolutionists the world over to accept uncritically everything done or said today in Yugoslavia by the Yugoslav leaders. But there is at the same time no inclination whatever on their part to begrudge or belittle the wonderful revolutionary upsurge of the Yugoslav Communist workers and peasants, because they haven't yet accepted all of Trotsky's conceptions and teachings. The Fourth International firmly considers its program as the only adequate vehicle for world revolution. But it is furthest from the wish to impose that program mechanically upon the masses. It wants to bring that program to the masses through the avenues of their own experiences. If this applies to the masses throughout the world, then how much more directly does it apply to the revolutionary masses of Yugoslavia, who have been fighting such a valiant struggle against imperialism and Stalinism for ten full years now!

Critical support to the Communist leaders of Yugoslavia: unconditional support to the Yugoslav revolution and the Yugoslav workers' state! That is our principled line, which today expresses the interests of the international working class and of the international socialist revolution. Revolutionists all over the world have learned how to swim against the stream for 25 long and difficult years and against incalculable odds. They have almost forgotten what a victorious revolution looks like, with all its flecks and spots, its face grimy, and its walk not always elegant and straight. Today, they are learning again what it means to fight side by side with a living revolution, without giving up an iota of their own program but, without underestimating the powerful contributions new victorious revolutions always make to the arsenal of Marxism. It is time to day to learn how to say "YES!" with full consciousness and enthusiasm to such a revolution. It is time to salute it with love and pride, for it is putting into practice a great part of what we affirmed in theory during the long years of reaction.

WEST GERMAN GOVT. FEELS UNITY PRESSURE

By Charles Hanley

East Germany's Prime Minister Otto Grotewohl has addressed a letter to West German Chancellor Conrad Adenauer, asking for the reunification of Germany by means

of simultaneous general elections in East and West Germany and the elaboration of a new constitution by a National Assembly.

Thus the East German Stalinists adopt the proposals recently made by the Prague conference of East European Stalinist foreign ministers. Their aim is to counter the imperialist policy of making West Germany an anti-Soviet bastion.

The German people have not forgotten that the German Stalinists, despite their unification propaganda, contributed to the dismemberment of Germany by formally approving the annexation of the purely German provinces of East Germany by Poland and the USSR. Yet East and West Germans are willing to use any opportunity to overcome their country's artificial division created by the occupiers, and to prevent it from being plunged into a fratricidal war of foreign interests.

The West German masses are opposed to rearmament. A survey made by the German magazine Der Spiegel reveals that 80 percent of the population reject any remilitarization.

"Why can't the German question be solved by the German people itself? The reunification of Germany would be an important step towards peace. We don't like the Stalinists at all; but let's try all the same to have talks with them and to find out if they sincerely wish to end this period of disunity and of the iron curtain." That seems to be the popular reaction produced by the Grotewohl letter.

SOCIAL DEMOCRATS

Public opinion has urged Adenauer not to flatly refuse negotiations with the East German government. There is some disagreement on the question inside the Social Democratic Party: Social Democrat leader Kurt Schumacher is against consideration of the Grotewohl proposal, while Berlin's Mayor Ernst Reuter would welcome unity between East and West Germany provided that the East German government agrees to introduce freedom of speech, of the press, of organization, etc., before any general elections, and that it abrogates the new totalitarian omnibus bill called "Law for the Defense of Peace."

There exists in Germany today a very strong current against militarism and for reunification. It is only natural that the Stalinists should try to get something out of this situation. But the decisive step toward an independent, united Germany would

be the political mass action of German labor. The Stalinists, on the contrary, always anxious to cook up a deal with the world bourgeoisie, wish to spread the illusion of a "National Front" with "patriotic" capitalists.

Neither the stoges of the Kremlin, nor the lackeys of Wall Street can create a unified, independent Germany. Only the pressure of the German working class can change the present German situation. Therefore, the German Marxists and their excellent weekly paper Freie Tribüne engage in a consistent effort to form a revolutionary socialist movement capable of leading the German proletariat towards victory. The great number of friends and adherents they have already won proves how many German workers begin to realize the mistakes and crimes of Stalinism and reformism and the necessity for an independent, truly Leninist workers party.

Local Addresses Of Socialist Workers Party

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

BOSTON—Workers Educational Center, 20 Stuart St. Open Tues., 5:30-9 P.M. Social last month.

BUFFALO—Militant Forum, 629 Main Street, 2nd fl. Open every afternoon except Sun., Thurs. 3:30-5 P.M.

CHICAGO—169 W. Washington St., Rm. 312-314. Phone Dearborn 2-4707.

CLEVELAND—Rock Hall, 1446 E. 82nd St. (off Wade Park Ave.), every Sun., 9 P.M.

DETROIT—6108 Linwood Ave. Open Mon. through Sat., 12-5 P.M. Phone TT 7-6297.

FLINT—SWP, 1507 Oak Street. Phone 22496.

LOS ANGELES—Militant Pub. Ass'n, Rm. 525, 124 W. 6th St. Phone VAndyk 8063.

MILWAUKEE—917 N. 3rd St., 3rd fl. Open Sun. through Fri., 7:30-9:30 P.M. Phone Hooking 2-6357.

MINNEAPOLIS—10 South 4th St. Open daily except Sun., 10 A.M.-6 P.M. Library, bookstore, Phone Main 778.

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

NEWARK—423 Springfield Avenue.

NEW YORK CITY—116 University Place. Phone: AL 5-7852.

PHOENIX—103 W. 110th St., Rm. 23. Open discussion, every Thurs., 8 P.M.

SAN FRANCISCO—1738 Fillmore Avenue, 4th fl. Open daily except Sun., 12-4:30 P.M. Phone SF 6-0410.

SEATTLE—Maynard Bldg., 1st Ave., So. and Washington, Rm. 201. Open Mon. through Sat., 12-4 P.M. Branch meeting every Thurs., 7:30 P.M. Library, bookstore, Phone Main 9278.

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

YOUNGSTOWN—234 E. Federal St. Call 3-1719.

Subscribe!

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

Name

Street

City

State

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

Militant on Sale in Chicago

51st St. El Stand
47th St. El Stand
P. O. News
(Monroe & Dearborn)
SWP Hall
166 W. Washington

5th Ward Campaign Hdqs.
5558 S. Ellis — Wed Eve.
Front of Univ.
Chicago Bookstore
(Thurs. Aft. 12-1 P. M.)

Subscriptions: \$3 per year!
\$1 for 6 months. Foreign:
\$3.50 per yr. \$1 for 6 mos.
Entered as second class
matter Mar. 7, 1944 at the
Post Office at New York,
N. Y., under the act of Mar.
3, 1879.

THE MILITANT

Published Weekly in the Interests of the Working People
THE MILITANT PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION
116 University Pl., N. Y. 3, N. Y. Phone: AL 5-7460
Editor: GEORGE BREITMAN
Business Manager: JOSEPH HANSEN

Single Copies (U. S. and
Canada): 30 each in U. S. 40
each in foreign countries.
Signed articles by contribu-
tors do not necessarily re-
present The Militant's policies.
These are expressed in its
editorials.

Vol. XV - No. 3

Monday, January 15, 1951



TROTSKY

Why Arms Programs Lead to War

Consequently, militarism has grown. All this is one of the most important obstacles in the way of economic progress. One of the main causes of the (first world) war was the intolerable burden of armed peace upon the European economy. A horrible end was preferable to horror without end. But it turned out that this is no end at all, the horror after the end is even more horrible than it was before the horrible end, that is, before the last war.

— Leon Trotsky, First Five Years of the Communist International. 1921.



LENIN

Dewey Wants Spartan State

N. Y. Governor Dewey has proposed a state law which would give him absolute dictatorial powers. The lives, the labor, and the homes of all N. Y. citizens would be subjected completely to the governor's will, under his bill.

Specifically, the bill would empower Dewey to conscript manpower, control distribution of all goods including food, abolish the right of free assembly, force evacuation of homes, and practically anything else that comes to his mind.

This measure is proposed soon after Dewey demanded the building of a 100-division army and preparation for all-out war. These two proposals make up Dewey's blue-print for the future of New York State, and it is what he and others like him seek to impose on the country as a whole.

Arguing his case, Dewey stated that it was necessary for the U.S. to follow a "Spartan course," in order to win the "struggle for survival" against totalitarianism.

Aristotle described the Spartan state as an "unlimited and perpetual generalship." That is what is being prepared in the U.S. A permanent dictatorship, suppression of the people so that they cannot protest the heavy burdens of war — permanent, because not one capitalist

spokesman sees any end in sight to the world crisis.

Thus, to defend our freedoms we are asked to give them up; to save "democracy" in the world, the people are to submit to one-man rule at home.

It would be a serious error to take this Dewey program lightly. This is the same man to whom Truman recently offered the key post of Secretary of State; he is governor of a great state; he is one of the top Republican leaders.

All the steps thus far taken toward a police state are but preliminaries to far more brutal measures. The Taft-Hartley Law, the McCarran-Kilgore "dangerous thoughts" Law, the campaign of red-baiting and intellectual terror pave the way to dictatorship equal to, if not more drastic than that of the Nazis.

The United States, actively supporting dictator-governments abroad, is moving toward "Sparta" at home.

This road is fraught with dangers not only for the American people, but also for the capitalist class.

The American people are rooted deeply in the traditions of democracy. To destroy their freedoms will bring the most profound political and social repercussions. The people will rise up and tell the Deweys: "This is not Sparta. This is the U.S.A. We are no man's slaves!"

How to Police Prices

Senator Ellender of Louisiana, chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, is calling for an immediate investigation of price-gouging. That such an investigation is needed is evidenced by the statement of Price Stabilizer diSalle that the voluntary hold-the-price-line program is a dismal failure. Actually there have been hundreds of price increases since Dec. 1, the date on which the voluntary plan was supposed to go into effect. Many of these increases were on foodstuffs.

Ellender, arguing that the farmers are not getting the price increases but that they are being pocketed by jobbers, wholesalers and retailers, predicted that an exposure of the current "gouging" would result in the people themselves becoming price "policemen." He held that this was preferable to the government putting "500,000 men on the payroll" to prevent violations of price ceilings which it will soon be necessary to set.

If housewives are really to be protected from extortion across the grocery counter in the present period of inflation and in the period of greater inflation ahead price control will have to be in the hands of the people. Senator Ellender prefers the people themselves policing prices rather than putting 500,000 agents on the federal payroll. So do we — though for different reasons. There can be no effective control of prices in a system based on profit—and graft—except by

those who have the greatest interest in controlling prices. This means the working people and lower middle class.

How can they do it? We, for a long time, have told how: Organization by the trade unions of committees to police the stores. These committees composed and supplemented by housewives should have genuine power to punish price gougers — to impose fines and close up incorrigibles. On a national scale they should be able to cope with the big gougers — the meat trust, the milling companies, etc. A "meat famine" for higher profits such as was staged by the packers in the last days of the OPA would be summarily dealt with by taking over the industry in conjunction with the packing house unions and running it under workers control.

The experience in this country with the ineffective OPA and the example of the omnipotent black market in Europe point the lesson. Government pronouncements and enforcement agencies either do not want to or cannot deal with the problem. When the housewife is an eye and ear of — or a member of — her local price committee, there will be mighty few violations unreported. And when the union committee to which she reports, or belongs, is armed with power to punish the violators there will be precious few merchants or middlemen long engaging in that form of free enterprise known as price-gouging.

A Model Spokesman for Labor

Last week we were privileged to publish the speech delivered by Dr. Colvin R. deSilva, Trotskyist member of the Ceylon Parliament, before a session of the International Labor Office Plantation Committee held in December in Indonesia. Dr. deSilva spoke there as the representative of the All-Ceylon Estate Workers Union. The session included delegations of workers, plantation owners and government officials.

In such gatherings the capitalists and their representatives always speak boldly in their own class interests. But not so labor's leaders. They plead for compromise and all too often against the workers' interests.

Dr. deSilva minced no words. Noteworthy was his reply to the hypocritical charge of being "unconciliatory." "We answer," he said, "it is necessary to be intransigent on issues of principle; we have never ruled out negotiations on other things."

When the employers referred to their "humanitarian" proletarian reforms, they were properly called to order: "But what does the claim (provision of medical and other amenities) really amount to?" ask-

ed Dr. deSilva. "Only to this, that like every butcher, they fatten their cattle for the slaughter! The point, however, is not the fattening — the issue is the slaughter."

American workers are well able to share in the militant spirit of these remarks. It was in the same spirit that Tom Paine, the tribune of our own Independence struggle, answered the British dealers in human cattle. "Sirs," said Paine, "when any man tells me 'I am born your master,' I set my foot on him."

Unfortunately, though born and bred in the school of freemen, the American workers have, as yet, no official leaders of the same stamp as Dr. deSilva. Our working class, so advanced technologically, has been retarded politically by its leaders, falling so far behind the Ceylonese workers that we haven't even a labor spokesman in Congress today.

But Dr. deSilva's example is a model of genuine working class representation. Contrast this with the conduct of the AFL and CIO "statesmen," who beg for small favors and hold back the workers' militancy. What American workers need so urgently are incorruptible leaders such as the Ceylonese already have.

German Steel Workers Ask Workers' Control

More than a million West German steel and mine workers — most of them in the industrial heart of Europe, the Ruhr — are preparing to go out on strike for a far-reaching demand aimed at workers control of industry.

The West German Metal Workers Union, according to a N. Y. Times report from Frankfurt on Jan. 4, has instructed its half million members to strike on Feb. 1. This decision followed an 86% vote of the membership for the walkout. Their decision is expected to be duplicated by 570,000 coal, iron ore and salt miners who are scheduled to take a strike vote on Jan. 17 to enforce the same demand as that pushed by the steel workers — "co-determination."

This demand is embodied in the unions' program calling for "Mittelbestimmungsrecht" — roughly translated as "co-determination" — in the management of the steel plants and mines. They are seeking an equal say with the owners in the operation of industry, from production to sales.

The Ruhr steel and coal cartels — the industrial barons who financed and armed Hitler — have been putting up fierce opposition to the demand, which they correctly fear would lead a long way in the direction of full workers control and the eventual nationalization of West Germany's major industries and source of greatest profits for revived German capitalism.

AGAINST WORKERS CONTROL

Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, Christian Democratic (Catholic) head of the Bonn government, which is dominated by the Ruhr cartels, big landowners, former Nazis and the Catholic hierarchy, has been instrumental in blocking legislation to achieve "co-determination." He tried to deny, in a letter to the steel union's president, Dr. Hans Boeckler, that the workers have the right to strike for anything but wages and hours.

The strike votes to force passage of a "co-determination" bill comes as a direct challenge to Adenauer. Before this show of power, he is reported to be considering endorsement "in principle" of a bill to concede the unions' right to "bargain" with employers on matters related to production, purchasing and sales.

Trotskyists Score In Ceylon Election

COLOMBO, Ceylon — In Moratuwa, a suburban town, the Trotskyist party, Lanka Sama Samaja, scored a victory in the elections for City Council. Of twelve seats the Trotskyists won five, the Communist (Stalinist) Party, one, while the main capitalist party, the U.N.P., won three seats. This town has a very wealthy section and the capitalists organized an all-out fight against the Lanka Sama Samaja Party with the clergy delivering weekly attacks against the Trotskyists. Despite this the people, many of them Catholics, organized parades to the polls to vote for the Trotskyist candidates. A Trotskyist will be chairman of the City Council.

A Reader Gets Mad

Dear Ed: Sometimes I get mad about small things. I read The Militant and I think I agree mostly on what The Militant gets mad about on the big things.

But almost every day, if you read a paper or look around about you, there are other things, smaller, I guess, but important, which we ought to talk about either to keep people mad or to get them to be.

Like today. Today there is a little guy by the name of Alfred Albert Niepel. Lives somewhere in New York, the Bronx I think from the address. They say, as a sidelight in this story I read, he had a son who flew with the French Air Force in World War II and was killed in combat. There were also two daughters. They served with the French Red Cross. They died too, in the line of duty.

Well, our friend Mr. Alfred Albert Niepel (a N. Y. paper tells us, Jan. 9) was a "clean but shabbily dressed elderly man, who stood there with stooped shoulders, had worked steadily for twenty-five years and during that time had changed employment only three times."

And right now Mr. Alfred Albert Niepel is spending thirty days in jail.

as well as wages and hours. But the German workers are asking for more than the right to "bargain" — that is, discuss — these matters. They want the direct power to decide and control.

This development of a possible tremendous class struggle in Allied-occupied West Germany has struck consternation in both the German ruling class and the occupation authorities. It threatens to aggravate the powerful mass opposition to the scheme for rearming German capitalism which U.S. imperialism and the Bonn regime are plotting.

BOOM IN RUHR

The Times reveals that the giant steel and iron industries of the Ruhr are experiencing a tremendous boom and are "months behind the staggering number of Western defense orders." A strike in the Ruhr would mean a serious set-back to the Western imperialist armaments program.

That strikes involving more than a million workers are threatened in West Germany is testimony to the great resurgence of organized strength, confidence, militancy and class consciousness among the German workers, who before they were betrayed to Hitler by the Stalinists and Social Democrats, were the most powerful

organized workingclass in Europe. Their great socialist tradition has survived the 12-year Nazi terror and the post-war Allied military rule and is now beginning to emerge.

MOOD OF WORKERS

The Stalinists have little influence among these workers. Their present leaders are conservative and Social Democratic types who would compromise with the ruling class at the drop of a hat. But the fact that these leaders are forced to go along with and even defend the strike votes is indication of the mood and temper of the German workers today.

Those who have been inclined to low-rate the German working class and write it off as a revolutionary factor should take a closer look at the developments in West Germany today. A million organized German steel and mine workers on the march and boldly reaching out for control of industry marks the reemergence of the potentially most powerful revolutionary force on the European scene. It is the intervention of this class force — heralded by the struggle over "co-determination" — that may well prove decisive in shattering the reactionary schemes of both Western imperialism and Stalinism.

U.S. "LIBERATION" MEANS ITS RUIN, KOREA LEARNS

Charles Moore, United Press Staff writer, in a Tokyo story dated Jan. 8 raises the question: "How much more 'liberation' can the people of Korea stand?"

Moore continues, "The Korean equivalent of John Q. Public is taking a terrific beating because of the war. His home has been destroyed. His job has disappeared because factories were destroyed. He and his family have become ragged, cold, hungry wanderers. 'It is a hard fact but true fact that most of the destruction was done by the Americans.'"

This awareness of the wholesale destruction of Korea by the American army is not something that has just dawned on the observers of the Korean war.

A DEAD PATIENT

As far back as Aug. 17 Walter Lippman, conservative political writer, arguing against the bombing policy of the Air Force in Korea, wrote: "Even if the operation is successful the patient will be dead. We shall not have proved that we can contain aggression but only that we can wreck a country."

Hanson Baldwin, N. Y. Times military analyst discussing the "political and moral disadvantages of strategic bombing" wrote on Aug. 21: "Strategic bombing . . . is a two-edged sword. Inevitably we kill and maim civilians, including women and children, for civilians live near freight yards and industrial areas. We are indignant and rightly so, about North Korean atrocities against our prisoners. Yet, as North Koreans, would we not be equally indignant against Americans if our women and children were slain by American bombs?"

U.S. saturation bombing in Korea, with the threat of the Atom Bomb always in the background, caused great fears not only in Asia but in Europe. As one West German put it: "We might survive a Russian occupation, but never an American liberation."

The responsibility for the destruction of Korean cities, towns and villages rests with the American military leaders. As the UP writer Moore points out: "The Communists can assert that they have not wrecked Korea. . . The Chinese have avoided destructive assaults on cities and towns. They have forced U.N. forces to pull out and usually in pulling out the U.N. forces have destroyed everything of value to the enemy."

Nor has this policy been confined to the period when U.S. troops were retreating, for, as Moore admits: "Retreating or advancing, U.N. forces have found it necessary to bomb and shell and burn many of North Korea's towns and practically all of her industry."

According to the press, the U.S. army is following a "scorched earth" policy. This is a new use of the term. Heretofore "scorched earth" described the action of a native people retreating before a foreign invader and burning their own homes, crops, factories, etc. But the U.S. troops are scorched not their own land but that of the Koreans. In the old fashioned language of past wars this would not be a "scorched earth" policy but "laying waste with fire and sword."

Letters from Readers

A Reader Gets Mad

Dear Ed: Sometimes I get mad about small things. I read The Militant and I think I agree mostly on what The Militant gets mad about on the big things.

But almost every day, if you read a paper or look around about you, there are other things, smaller, I guess, but important, which we ought to talk about either to keep people mad or to get them to be.

Like today. Today there is a little guy by the name of Alfred Albert Niepel. Lives somewhere in New York, the Bronx I think from the address. They say, as a sidelight in this story I read, he had a son who flew with the French Air Force in World War II and was killed in combat. There were also two daughters. They served with the French Red Cross. They died too, in the line of duty.

Well, our friend Mr. Alfred Albert Niepel (a N. Y. paper tells us, Jan. 9) was a "clean but shabbily dressed elderly man, who stood there with stooped shoulders, had worked steadily for twenty-five years and during that time had changed employment only three times."

And right now Mr. Alfred Albert Niepel is spending thirty days in jail.

Want to know why? This same newspaper which certainly doesn't have the reputation of being friendly to people like Mr. Niepel, says that he is there "for stealing \$3.50 worth of postage stamps for resale to get money to eat." The guy who sent him there, incidentally, is a Federal Judge by the name of Henry W. Goddard.

Being a mild-tempered man myself, I'm glad I don't have to work myself up to agitate anyone about this. I can just use what the paper says about it: "in three days Niepel had stolen (this is the U.S. Attorney talking) \$3.50 worth of uncanceled postage stamps from packages, then putting the parcels back in the mail box."


Niepel's lawyer had a chance to say something too. From him we know that "Niepel left his job last October because of a nervous breakdown. Several days before his arrest he wandered into Grand Central Terminal to keep out of the rain. There he met a man who offered to buy uncanceled stamps for a portion of their value."

But naturally Mr. Niepel's lawyer would have to be (or try to be) friendly to him so it's probably better to get the straight story from the prosecutor who knew the real score against Mr. Niepel. According to him, and maybe we should remind you

again that we are telling you only what this reputable N. Y. newspaper had to say: "It took Niepel two days to get courage to steal the stamps from parcels he found lying alongside or on top of the mailbox. He was arrested Nov. 22 before he had time to sell the stamps to the stranger."

So right now Mr. Alfred Albert Niepel is in jail for thirty days. And it makes me plenty mad.

D. F.



Price 2.50 — Order from
PIONEER PUBLISHERS
116 University Place
New York 3, N. Y.

A PRIEST BLESSES ATOMIC AGGRESSION

By Joseph Keller

The American Catholic hierarchy has conscripted God into the service of the "preventive war" gang. One of the Vatican's most zealous recruiting sergeants and "Holy War" advocates, the Jesuit Father Edmund A. Walsh, vice president of Georgetown University and regent of its School of Foreign Affairs, has proclaimed that American imperialism would be "morally justified" to drop the Atom Bomb first.

This churchy blessing on the U.S. plutocracy's use of the Atom Bomb in a "preventive war" was delivered in a lengthy article written by Father Walsh for the Washington Star and distributed by NEA Service. It was published in full, with appropriate lurid headlines, by the Scripps-Howard chain and other newspapers which represent Catholic financial interests and political views in this country.

Father Walsh is an authoritative spokesman for the Catholic hierarchy on international affairs. His pronouncement on the "morality" of dropping the A-Bomb first was released in a demonstrative public form. This indicates that he was laying down a line that American Catholics are expected to support. It has not been repudiated by any Catholic authority, including Cardinal Spellman.

Immediate Atomic Attack

In his article, the Jesuit spokesman asks: "Would the U.S. be justified in launching an immediate atomic attack against an enemy power before it could use that devastating weapon against our cities?" He answers yes and cites the alleged example of "even Christ himself" to justify the "morality" of Truman launching undeclared atomic warfare on the civilian centers of the Soviet Union.

Claiming that the Soviet Union is preparing a "Pearl Harbor" atomic attack on the U.S., Father Walsh argues that "neither reason, nor theology, nor morals require . . . that we must await the first blow. . . ." Truman "would be morally justified" in using the Atom Bomb first if he "has sound reason to believe (that is, has moral certitude) that a similar attack is being mounted and ready to be launched against this country from any source. . . ."

Thus, whether or not Truman plunges the world into atomic slaughter by suddenly dropping the A-Bomb on the Soviet Union is left up to the "moral certitude" of the ruling capitalist politicians and militarists, headed by Truman. His "moral certitude" already led him to use the Atom Bomb first, in August 1945, not against a potential atomic attacker, but on the defenseless cities of a defeated nation, Japan. It was Truman also who horrified the world recently with the threat of possible use of the A-Bomb on — not the Soviet Union — but China!

Father Walsh does not hesitate to falsify the New Testament to provide the final clincher to his "moral" argument. "Even Christ himself," he writes, "did not disdain to seize a lash and drive the hypocrites out of the temple." Not "hypocrites," reads the true text, but "money changers." (Matthew, 21; Mark, 11; Luke, 19; John, 2.) The Jesuitical falsification is not accidental.

For not "moral certitude" but sordid material interests are behind the Catholic hierarchy's sanction of "preventive atomic war." It seeks to regain the tremendous land-holdings, properties and tithes it has lost in Eastern Europe. It wants to grab back the huge revenues it was beginning to take out of China and Korea, where the Catholic Church made big advances under Chiang-Kai-shek and Syngman Rhee. It frantically fears the revolutionary threat to its vast slave-plantation interests in the Philippines, Indo-China and Indonesia.

It is not because the hierarchy fears a "Pearl Harbor" against this country by the Soviet Union that it now sanctifies the use of the Atom Bomb first by the U.S. It is afraid that the Kremlin will "craftily" avoid giving any pretext of "defense" to the American imperialists. How will the U.S. be able to justify morally an aggressive assault with Atom Bombs on the Soviet Union? The Jesuits do not lack for a formula. The "concept and term 'defense' must be clarified," writes Father Walsh, to permit Truman to drop the bomb first on the pretense that otherwise this country will be devastated in a "sneak attack."

If this "moral certitude" causes millions of civilians to "be harmed by American necessity to use the bomb in self-defense," says Father Walsh, that is merely a "regrettable effect, not intended as such" and "would be attributable to what moralists (read Jesuits) describe as the indirect voluntary." It is the Jesuitical plea that the child bystander slain by a gangster's bomb was not "intended" as the victim and therefore the murderer is innocent.

Truman Scorns Popular Plea To Stop Korea War At Once

(Continued from Page 1)

Moore, United Press staff writer in Tokyo, was speaking in his Jan. 8 dispatch, when he asked: "How much more 'liberation' can the people of Korea stand?" The Korean "equivalent of John Q. Public," Moore reported through the censorship, "is taking a terrific beating. . . . His home has been destroyed. His job has disappeared because factories were destroyed. He and his family have become ragged, cold, hungry wanderers." He added: "It is a hard fact but true fact that most of the destruction was done by the Americans."

This is not the story on Truman's Korean adventure we got from his "State of the Union" message. He is warring there, he claimed, "for freedom for the peoples of Asia" — the peoples whose one great cry is for U.S. imperialism and all other imperialisms to get out of Asia and let the Asian people alone.

To bring the same brand of "liberation" to Europe as he brought to the Korean people, Truman put first on his 10-point program "appropriations for our military build-up"; second, "extension and revision of the Selective Service Act"; and third, "military and economic aid to help build up the strength of the free world."

By the first, he means an annual federal budget of \$75 billion, expected to rise and rising to an estimated "full-scale war" peak of \$150 billion. By the second, he means dragging the 18-year-olds, and even 17-year-olds, out of the high schools and into the barracks and fox-holes. As for "aid to the free world," he gave several samples of it just prior to his message. He sent U.S. military authorities to Spain "to make cautious soundings" of Dictator Franco on

whether he would be willing to supply 60,000 troops for Gen. Eisenhower's "Western European" army "if the United States agreed to arm her (Spain)." (N. Y. Times, Jan. 8.) Other aid to the "free" world was sent in the same week to Butcher Chiang Kai-shek in the form of arms. Another U.S. mission was in clerical-fascist Portugal making arrangements for the shipment of war supplies to Dictator Salazar.

To provide this "aid to the free world," Truman informed us, we are going to have to accept "heavy cuts in the civilian use" of copper, rubber, aluminum and other essential materials — that is, scarcity and inflation — and a "major increase in taxes." Truman amplified the latter point in a letter to Senator Byrd, saying the people would be taxed "until it hurts."

He talked vaguely about "stabilizing" prices. Meanwhile, food prices are going up at a rate of between three and four per cent a month; rents are soaring in the wake of widespread decontrol; and the 20% increase in withholding tax bites deeper into wage-earners' pay-checks, with worse yet to come.

Only the war profiteers got consolation from Truman's message. He did not mention the word profits once — or profits taxes. He did not mention the words, "Fair Deal," or "Taft-Hartley Act repeal" or "Fair Employment Practices Commission." He said "priority" must be given "to activities that are urgent — like military procurement and atomic energy (read A-Bombs)." But the government must "practice rigid economy in its nondefense activities (read social welfare program)." Guns instead of butter for everyone — except the rich! The real "State of the Union."

"Debt of Honor"

By George Lavan

I was a sucker. The capitalist politicians have swindled me in the past of my money and my vote but I never thought they could swindle any sympathy out of me. But they did. I refer to the Hanley case that made such a big scandal during the New York elections last November.

Last June Governor Dewey declared he wouldn't run again and pledged his support to Joe Hanley, the Lieutenant-Governor, for the governorship. When nomination time rolled around Dewey had changed his mind, but he couldn't just announce he hadn't located any better pickings and decided to be governor again. That isn't how it's done in politics. No. Dewey had to start a movement to draft himself.

Only one obstacle stood in the way — Hanley, whom Dewey had already endorsed publicly for the governorship. So they got Joe Hanley down to a "conference" in a New York hotel and gave him the works. After six hours of threats, bribes, offers, etc., Hanley gave in. He announced that for the good of the country Dewey should be drafted. Dewey replied that because of the Korean war he would go — back to the governor's mansion. Hanley then accepted the nomination for U.S. Senator — a post he had no prospect of winning.

This sort of thing goes on all the time in the Democratic and Republican parties and the public never hears about it. In this case, however, the whole thing came to light. A letter of Hanley's leaked out. It described "certain unalterable and unquestionable propositions" made to him by Dewey. "If I consent to take the nomination to the U.S. Senate, I am definitely assured of being able to clean up my financial obligations within ninety days, so that I would be clear for the first time in twenty years." The letter also told of "an iron-clad, unbreakable arrangement" that when he lost the Senate race he would be given a life-time job with the state.

The mood of the letter was pathetic. Mention was made of the writer's failing eyesight and closed with the confession, "I am humiliated, disappointed and heartsick." Subsequent explanations by the Republican leaders made Hanley

an even more pathetic figure. His debts, as Gov. Dewey and others told the public, resulted from his sense of honor. For twenty years Hanley had heroically been trying to pay off a \$150,000 debt resulting from the failure of a bank in which his father had been a stockholder.

I figured that here was a good man fallen among politicians. To pay off the depositors in his father's bank was an honorable thing — I thought all men of honor had long disappeared from the capitalist political scene. Yet this former Methodist preacher proved the species wasn't extinct. Of course he was the exception and when he died the species of honest capitalist politician would be as dead as the Dodo. In fact I was glad he didn't have any chance of winning the Senate race. He was too honest to go to Washington.

After Hanley's defeat Dewey kept the "iron-clad" promise and gave him a job with the state's Veterans' setup at \$16,000 plus \$4,000 state pension — or more yearly pay than when he was Lieut.-Gov. I didn't think he could do much for the vets but I didn't begrudge him this payoff.

But now I find I was taken in. A Senate subcommittee has found out that Hanley's parents never owned any stock in an Iowa bank that failed. Moreover, a \$150,000 note from Hanley payable to an old schoolmate turns out to be a phony. The old schoolmate had never heard of it, leave alone got any of it.

Dewey has shut up like a clam on the mystery. Hanley, himself, won't talk save to repeat the slogan "debt of honor." That phrase "debt of honor" sent me to the dictionary which says: "A debt, as one incurred by betting or gambling, which is not recoverable by law. . . ."

Could it be that Hanley lost the \$150,000 in a crap game? That would put him in quite a different light. If so, I retract what I said about his not being the type to go to the Senate. He'd fit right in with the "calculated risk" takers of our foreign policy. And then they gamble with other people's money and lives. Probably he could qualify for some games with Truman himself and the other Pendergast machine boys who hang around the White House.

On the Liberal Front

By Tom Conlan

In the best of circumstances the liberals, especially our domestic variety, offer none too pleasant a sight; in critical times they exude a rather pungent odor. The contemporary lot not only is no exception, but has sunk to levels that some of their American predecessors would have surely resented, if only out of regard for personal hygiene.

Most of these self-appointed "torch-bearers of culture" have accepted, without noticeably disturbing their digestion, Truman as their leader. At all events, they keep touting, around the clock, for Truman's policies, as each issue of *The Nation* or *The New Republic* testifies. Recently a dissident wing has apparently begun to sprout among them.

The occasion for this was Hoover's Dec. 20 speech which, as Ted O. Thackrey, editor of the *Daily Compass*, bewails, found a sympathetic response among some liberals. "I find myself increasingly irritated by those of my progressive and liberal friends who are taking a curious comfort from Herbert Hoover's 'analysis' of the bankruptcy of our foreign policy and plans for a future course of action," he said.

In addition to the Trumanite liberals and the comforted neo-Hoover converts, there is a small but articulate "independent" minority left stranded somewhere in between the foundered Wallaceite movement and the quicksands of Stalinism.

This aggregation is now engaged in a frantic search for "guarantees" against war. Or as Ted O. Thackrey phrases it "with the thoughtful search for alternatives to Armageddon."

The best one among these thoughtful seekers is the informed and expert reporter I. F. Stone, now on tour of Europe. He has recently cabled a series of articles from Paris, whose chief aim is not so much to report the situation in Europe as to plump for the projected "Four Power Conference on Germany." Stone obviously wants to do everything in his power to promote the success of this conference and avert the "dangers" confronting

it. Thereupon hinges peace, he hopes.

In his eyes the root of all the troubles is "a world which has not yet settled down into a new balance of power." A shrewd enough observation. But what prevents such a settling down? According to Stone, it is such things as "obsession with communism," "bogyman thinking" especially in Washington, "the casting of all activity and thought into negativistic and hateful terms," and the like.

There is, of course, abroad "the power of love," says Stone. Unfortunately this power is supplemented by "the self-destructive nature of hate," out of which arise wars. And so Stone appeals to the West, in a letter to the *London Times*. The West, he assures, does not need a "new faith." All it needs is "faith in its institutions." Nothing more; nothing less.

It is sad to see a person with Stone's unquestionable talent and ability appealing to insolvent capitalist bankrupts to have "faith" in their own outlived order. It is highly irritating to hear him add his voice to this chorus of civilized ignorance and self-deception.

In ordinary human language, what all the Thackreys offer as a solution is pacifism, whose outstanding trait is a desire to create guarantees against war; but whose actual political role is to throw up a smokescreen for the war-makers, as the case of Henry Wallace has so strikingly demonstrated.

Weighed down by the ballast of bourgeois prejudices, lagging criminally behind the times and the needs and tasks they pose, intellectual snobs such as the *Compass* editor strut about like castrated Gullivers among American and West European Lilliputians, giving good advice. And what are they peddling as the newest of all revelations? A diluted version of pacifism, and to make it more palatable, admiring wit, light as a bride's biscuit. If that is the company I. F. Stone chooses to keep, he can have it.

Goodbye, My Son

By Genora Bollinger

Records show that Dennis Robert Johnson was born March 7, 1931 in Flint, Mich. and died December 26, 1951 in Flint, Mich. Behind the cold data in the files there is a story — too often of suffering, of frustration, of heartbreak.

This 19-year old boy didn't have half a chance under a decaying capitalist system of wars and depression and so fell its helpless victim just as thousands of his generation are now daily falling.

This class-conscious boy, of good physique and mentality, fell victim to the horrible crippling disease of multiple sclerosis. All efforts to obtain medical aid in various parts of the country came to naught. A New York research project became interested in his case because it was "one of the youngest cases on record" but Dennis was "not a resident of New York State" — he didn't have a passport to save his life!

In April 1950 a Multiple Sclerosis Clinic was opened in Detroit. After weeks of waiting for an appointment Dennis was examined at the clinic. The doctor in charge indicated an interest in getting Dennis admitted to the hospital connected with the clinic, if arrangements could be made through the Michigan Crippled Children's Fund. After months of red tape Dennis was turned down. The doctor of the MS Clinic attempted to provide the necessary life-saving medicine for the State institution where Dennis was hospitalized. The medical director of the State Hospital refused on the grounds that there was not "sufficient personnel to administer the drugs."

With the aid of a probate Judge another effort was being made when Dennis, hopefully waiting for relief, was struck by a series of attacks that were to lead to his death 12 days later. By this time his small faith in the inadequate public agencies and doctors had been completely shattered and, dying, he asked to "come home for Christmas." "The (State Hospital) doctors are only waiting for me to finish this quickly. . . so they can hold their jury." Dennis "came home for Christmas." — And surrounded by those he loved, he died Christmas night.

Dennis knew that the solution to all of suffering humanity was in Socialism. To doctors

and patients alike he would pass on his weekly copy of *The Militant*. He fought for his principles in every way he could. He organized a protest movement against the vicious beating of a young Negro patient; and this was an important factor that led the former Governor Sigler to open a public investigation of brutality in State institutions. When interviewed by the Governor, Dennis fearlessly gave the details — even though he had been severely penalized by the hospital authorities for his role in the protest.

It is not easy to say goodbye to you, my beloved son. The cards were stacked against you — we both knew it even though we didn't say it to each other. What chance was there for us when fly-speck appropriations are made for life-saving medical research and hospitals while billions are dished out for death.

Words are inadequate to describe the torture of being turned down by calloused agencies, the anguish of sympathetic doctors with no means of aid, the cruelty of public officials with their pat excuses. . . . The endless forms, documents, applications, sworn affidavits, appointments, questionings. . . . Trying and hoping with a dead hope. . . . And you waiting patiently, so patiently in fading hope of that aid. In vain! We both knew. And to the end we both kept the disappointments from each other.

There is little consolation in the knowledge that I am not alone in my tears and bitterness today. Thousands upon thousands of other mothers' and fathers' hearts were also broken this "glorious Christmas season" by notices that their sons' bodies had been placed in Korea on the mass funeral pyre of capitalist war and greed.

Dearest son, you knew, as we know, that someday in the near future the grief and despair of mothers and fathers and young people the world over will turn to wrath. A terrible wrath that shall fill the cold-blooded murderers with fear and trembling. And out of those mighty flames of wrath and suffering will emerge the Socialist future of mankind, the society of peace and plenty and freedom, we so often talked about. The words of love and respect and encouragement you spoke to us on your deathbed shall help us to carry on the fight you understood so well. Goodbye, my son.

VOLUME XV

MONDAY, JANUARY 15, 1951

NUMBER 3

Railroad Men Rip Truman's Proposed Pact

The twenty-two month dispute between the four operating brotherhoods and the railroad companies which culminated in the mass "sick report" walkout early December, is still unsettled.

The brotherhoods are flatly rejecting the Truman-Steelman formula. In a statement exposing the inadequacy of the government proposals, 260 general chairmen representing 300,000 railway trainmen, firemen and engineers stated:

"We want to emphasize that we have been in close contact with the rank and file ever since the (Truman-Steelman) proposal was received. Our action here represents the groundswell of bitter opposition back home." The statement listed many points which the railroad workers would not accept.

40 HOUR WEEK

1. The proposal does not provide for the 40-hour week at no reduction in take-home pay. It agrees to the 40-hour week in principle, but postpones its application until the "manpower situation warrants." One million non-operating railroad workers now have the 40-hour week at no reduction in pay.

2. The proposed wage adjustment of 25c. an hour is insufficient to meet increased living costs. The rail workers are trying to get a third round increase of 35c. an hour while other unions have received a fourth and fifth round.

UPROOTING OF HOMES

3. Certain new rules proposed by Truman-Steelman would increase company profits at the expense of railroad workers. For example, "the interdivisional run" rule would uproot the homes of tens of thousands of men and force them to move to other communities, at great expense and inconvenience. Another rule would run the caboose through, instead of switching in the yards as runs are concluded, thus forcing men to move out their belongings at the end of each run, sleep in hotels and buy their meals out. The caboose is like another home. This change would save the railroads some money, but would inconvenience and add expense for the workers.

The operating unions have refused to accept these provisions. They also demand that in any new agreement the escalator clause be included, plus an annual four-cent wage hike as an improvement factor.

The railroad workers want a contract at least as good as other unions; they are becoming steadily more impatient with the long drawn-out negotiations. That is what produced the "sick report" walkout in December.

This walkout was called off after Truman in his "national emergency" declaration attacked the rail workers and demanded they return to work at once. The stoppage was called off at the insistence of the union officials.

GREAT UNREST

The fact that the union officers have had to turn down the government formula for a settlement shows that great unrest has spread among the workers. It is generally agreed that should an attempt be made to cram the Truman-Steelman contract down the throats of the workers, another great railroad strike would result.

As a threat against further unauthorized actions, Truman is still pressing the government's "contempt" case against the four unions' officers, who were cited in December for failing to call off the "wildcat" strike. The case will be heard before Judge Michael L. Igou in Chicago Jan. 19.

Labor Gov't Spends Fortune for Stone

Britain's Labor government is reported spending many thousands of pounds in an effort to recover the ancient Stone of Scone. The Stone was believed stolen by anti-British Scottish nationalists.

This expenditure comes on the heels of official warnings to the British workers that they must cut their living standards even further to fulfill the government's Atlantic Pact arms program.

Deadline for Militant

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

THE MILITANT

Huge Protest Meeting in Harlem On Police Killing of Negro Veteran

Atom for War Only



Chairman Gordon Dean (L) of the Atomic Energy Commission tells press conference that plans for peaceful use of atomic energy will "have to be cut down." AEC member Henry B. Smyth (r.) affirms USSR has atom bomb.

Taft Tries to Narrow Down Rift on U.S. Foreign Policy

(Continued from page 1)

have been resumed. Washington's official acknowledgement of this, on Jan. 7, cannot be regarded otherwise than as another big concession to the China Lobby.

To sum up Taft's position: His major tactical difference with the administration lies in the emphasis he places on air and sea power, seeking to hold only those land positions in Asia as well as Europe where U.S. land forces can be confined to an "expandable" minimum; he further tends to subordinate operations on the European area to those undertaken in the Pacific.

STANDING ARMIES

Taft opposes huge standing armies primarily for economic reasons. With a keener class instinct than the braintrusts on whom Truman so completely relies, Taft, like the Hoover group, fears the stratospheric costs of all-out land forces, and the economic disaster this will sooner or later entail. Hence he is one of the "economy boys" who favor not more than a 40 billion dollar military budget, with approximately one-half going to the army. Here Taft collides not so much with the White House as with the Pentagon.

Passing on to the second important side of Taft's speech, what he has offered is the first concrete organizational measure for the establishment of "national unity" but of unity among the bitterly divided ruling circles. That measure is the imposition of control by Congress over the White House. Taft's attack on Truman and Acheson was ridiculously misconstrued by every pro-administration commentator with the exception of the informed Walter Lippman. Slicing through Taft's anti-administration demagoguery, intended for the grass roots, Lippman appraised at its worth Taft's bid to play the role of Britain's Churchill in the unfolding political crisis.

LEASH ON TRUMAN

Lippman, dotting the "i"s and crossing the "t"s of Taft's proposal, called attention to the fact that what is to be distributed by the capitalists is not the policy of the administration but the "President's judgment." This irascible old man who loses not alone his temper but whatever reason may be pumped into him, is hardly the individual upon whom reliance may be placed. He must be put in a political strait-jacket, the leading laces of which Taft proposes to hold in his hands.

This, assures Lippman, is exactly what the capitalist doctors should order. "I think," Lippman emphasizes, "Sen. Taft is quite right in insisting on revivifying the checks and the balances of the Constitution where upon Mr. Truman's judgment there depends the use of American armed forces."

Lippman's intervention, coupled with Taft's public proffer of the "olive-branch" to the administra-

NEW YORK CITY — On Jan. 6 over 3,000 people jammed the Refuge Temple in Harlem to protest the cold blooded police killing of veteran John Derrick, Dec. 6, 1950.

Several thousands were turned away, unable to get into the hall. This huge turnout demonstrated the rising anger of the Negro people in New York against unchecked police brutality.

Derrick was shot down in Harlem twelve hours after he was discharged from an army hospital. Whereas the daily press has studiously ignored the case, it has been kept alive by the *Amsterdam News*, a Negro bi-weekly.

At the mass meeting, sponsored by the NAACP and the GI John Derrick Committee, more than half a dozen eye-witnesses of the killing reported to the intensely interested audience what they saw. They unanimously agreed that the police lied when they charged that Derrick had pulled a gun on the cops. The witnesses testified that he had his hands over his head when the cops shot him. Derrick fell with his hands outstretched and did not move. Witnesses also stated that although they saw all that transpired, the police searched the body and did not find a gun. A gun was found only after the cops had driven away from the scene and later returned and again searched the body.

It is recognized by everyone in Harlem that the witnesses showed remarkable courage in testifying, since they are considered "on the spot" and marked for police vengeance. The killer-cops have been transferred by the Mayor as a concession to mass pressure. They have not been suspended or brought to trial. The Negro community is convinced that this is an invitation to Negro-hating cops to commit similar atrocities.

The Chairman of the protest meeting, was Rev. James H. Robinson. He introduced City Councilman Earl Brown, Bishop Drew and NAACP speakers, who stated their lack of faith in the police department, complained of the "bad morale" of the department, its tolerance of Negro-haters, and proposed that "something be done about it" by the mayor, the police commissioner and the district attorney.

They explicitly stated that they didn't want the Negro community to take any demonstrative action. Their views were embodied in three resolutions which they passed asking the mayor to receive their committee; for the

removal of the police involved in the killing; and a third point asking that police recruits be lectured on racial equality. The audience listened but were not enthusiastic.

State Assemblyman Elijah Crump proposed in addition that the meeting go on record for appointment of two Negro police captains and a Negro police inspector for the Harlem area. These proposals too were supported by the audience, but with little enthusiasm.

Congressman Adam Clayton Powell, sensing the real mood of the mass audience, received a tremendous ovation when he proposed a march on City Hall, and for action against every official involved in the killing, and in stalling the investigation. He reviewed the long list of similar meetings against police brutality and stated that the results every time were a complete whitewash by Democratic and Republican administrations alike. He demanded that every politician in office be put squarely on the spot.

The Stalinist Civil Rights Congress distributed a leaflet calling on everyone to "write and wire Mayor Impellitteri and District Attorney Hogan for prosecution of the two cops." They did not come out for mass action.

Thousands of Negroes turned out to this meeting because they were interested in a program of action. They did not get that program from the NAACP or the clergymen present. The only Negro politician who sounded a note of militancy was Powell. He proposed the only kind of program that could halt the wave of police brutality. A march on City Hall, which would be supported by thousands of Negro and white workers, would be a step forward in the fight. Everyone looks to the NAACP to take this type of action. Thus far the leadership has made no moves in this direction.

Whether Powell will follow up on his proposal is still to be seen. But whether he does or not, a great mass demonstration demanding punishment of the killer-cops and the ousting from office of every official who has helped cover up for the killers, would put the police on the defensive, and stop their campaign of intimidation cold.

GM Head Favors Sliding Pay Scale--At This Time

Much surprise has been expressed in the newspapers at the stand taken by Charles E. Wilson, president of General Motors, in favor of the cost-of-living escalator wage clause in union contracts. Most corporations are very jittery at the idea of the spread of the sliding-scale wage principle and government officials are leery of its effects on their wage-freezing plans.

At the same time, many workers no doubt are puzzled by the fact that a hard-boiled anti-labor corporation spokesman should support something that raises wages automatically as prices increase. "Maybe there's a hook in it, maybe it really isn't good for labor," they say.

NO HOOK

No, there isn't any hook in it and escalator clauses are the best immediate protection for real wages in an inflationary period. But, in spite of that, GM finds the escalator clause an advantage at this time and under the conditions in which the clause operates in the auto industry.

First of all, Wilson likes not the escalator clause so much as the fact that GM's contract runs for five years. GM workers' real wages are frozen for five years, except for a four-cent-an-hour annual "improvement" factor. GM has figured that with speedup and rationalization it can increase man-hour output so much each year that it can make even greater profits than before despite the "improvement factor."

Then, as Wilson acknowledged in a statement of Jan. 4, "No one should be so naive as to think that wages among organized groups will not be increased under pressure, if necessary, to make up for increases in the cost of living." In other words, labor —

particularly the auto workers — he concedes, are going to get higher wages by strikes, so he prefers to apply a flexible wage system that will mitigate strikes.

He can accept the escalator clause, however, only because in the coming period GM expects to make its profits on cost-plus government war contracts. The higher the costs — including labor costs — the higher the profits, so far as GM is concerned. The taxpayers, mostly the workers, pay for it. So he said that workers must accept a lower living standard to pay for the war, but

he suggests "they will do so more willingly if their nation's necessities in the form of taxation force them to do so than they would if they were forced to the same condition by employers holding down their wages." Thus, Wilson wants the government to take the onus for slashing living standards by raising taxes.

But what the corporations generally and the government fear is that the auto workers' example will spread and that tens of millions of workers will demand the escalator clause. That's what worries the wage "stabilizers."

VIETMINH ARMIES RETAINING UPPER HAND IN INDO-CHINA

The optimistic press releases by arrogant French General De Lattre announcing advances by his troops against the Vietminh independence forces are completely false, according to an analysis by Hanson Baldwin, N. Y. Times military expert.

"The long term balance is still against" the French, Baldwin says. The Vietminh have been following a "cat and mouse strategy" feeling out French weakspots. The native armies have about fifty-three battalions, as well-armed as the French, and fifty additional battalions more lightly armed.

Baldwin also points out that the anti-imperialist Vietminh armies are "growing faster than the French."

MELANCHOLY PROCESS

Assessing the general situation, the military analyst says, "To assess the immediate prospects is almost as melancholy a process as assessing the immediate prospects of the U.N. forces in Korea."

CHICAGO
Socialist Workers Party Hdqs.
5th Ward — 5555 Ellis
for
IRVING BEININ
SWP Candidate
Open Weds. from 7 to 10 p.m.