

Stalin's Hangmen Held 2 Trotskyist German Leaders

NEW YORK, April 14 — Two of the Trotskyist leaders in the Soviet-controlled zone of Berlin, Oskar Hippe and Walter Haas, have been seized by Stalin's secret police and face execution, Farrell Dobbs, national chairman of the Socialist Workers Party, announced today. Dobbs appealed to all labor and liberal organizations in this country to protest the arrest of these working class leaders and demand their release from the prison camps in the Soviet Union where they are held by the MVD.

From information just received from their friends in Berlin, Hippe and Haas were arrested late in 1948 by the Russian occupation forces and thrown into concentration camps. Both were well-known among Berlin workers for their decades of activity as revolutionary socialists in the German labor movement and their impeccable records of struggle against the Nazis.

VETERAN MILITANTS

Born in 1900, Oskar Hippe was an old Spartacist follower of Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht. One of the first to break with Stalinism among the German Communists, he became a leader

of the Berlin Trotskyist organization before 1933. After Hitler's downfall, he became a member of the Berlin council of the trade union movement reconstituted after the war. Arrested in September 1948, he was condemned by a Russian military court to 25 years of forced labor "for anti-Soviet activity and the formation of a clandestine organization."

Haas was arrested toward the end of 1948 under dramatic circumstances in the headquarters of the "German Economic Commission" — the center for the present Ministry of Planning for Eastern Germany. He resisted arrest and was severely beaten in public on that occasion. It is not known what verdict was imposed upon him, only that he was taken to a concentration camp in the USSR.

JAILED BY NAZIS TOO

The action of Stalin's secret police against these working class militants is all the more atrocious because both men suffered terribly from the Nazi terror. Oskar Hippe was three times arrested and tortured by the Nazis and imprisoned for two years in the internment camp at Luckau. Walter Haas was condemned for high treason by the Nazis for his role as a leader in the underground Trotskyist organization at Berlin. He spent three years in the prisons at Plötzensee and at Cottbus.

APPEAL FOR PROTESTS

"We call upon all organizations and individuals concerned with civil and labor rights to help save the lives of these two anti-fascists and working class leaders," said Dobbs. "Stalin's secret police must not be allowed to perpetrate such crimes against political and trade union opponents without vigorous protest from progressive world public opinion. Only through such protest will Stalin be forced to release his victims and stop his terror against militant workers and a free labor movement in Germany."

Letters and resolutions of protest should be sent to the Soviet Embassy in Washington, to the Socialist Unity Party (SED), the party in power in Eastern Germany, and to the editor of Neues Deutschland in Berlin, the central organ of the SED.

Trend Favors CIO Union Against UE In NLRB Polls

The trend appears to be favoring the CIO in NLRB elections to determine whether the CIO International Union of Electrical Workers, controlled by the Murray-Carey machine, or the independent United Electrical Workers, controlled by the Stalinists, will represent the workers in the electrical equipment industry.

In one of the latest elections, the employees of the Sperry Gyroscope Company in New York voted six-to-one in favor of the CIO union. The IUE got 4,017 votes; the UE, only 662. The outcome of this election is particularly significant because the Sperry workers have a tradition of militant unionism.

This vote follows the pattern of the earlier election in the General Motors Electrical Division. The IUE swamped the UE in every one of the five plants polled, for a total of 21,167 votes to 2,528 for the UE. Another important election will be held late this month, in the large Westinghouse system.

HOODLUM VIOLENCE ON THE SIDEWALKS OF N.Y.

By Albert Parker

Two men were standing on the sidewalk in front of a union hall in New York City, passing out leaflets to those who would take them.

Suddenly 12 men attacked them. The two fled across the street into a candy store, where one tried to keep the door closed while the other phoned for the police. Their pursuers smashed in the door of the store and beat them on the head with soda pop bottles so badly that they had to be treated at the hospital for severe head injuries. The store's interior was smashed in the process. Eight of the assailants were arrested as they sought to enter the back door of the union hall.

ORGANIZED VIOLENCE

This incident on April 7 is only the latest in a long series of acts of organized violence against the opponents of the Curran administration in the CIO National Maritime Union.

The two victims were Charles Keith and Morris Weiner, who had been expelled from the union by the Curran machine. The leaflets they were distributing dealt with the union's elections, which are now being held.

CURRAN'S STATEMENT

In this case, as in all the previous incidents of goon terror, Curran denied that he knew anything about it. But he sprang without any hesitation to the defense of his goons.

NEXT WEEK:

Special May Day edition

Make sure you get your extra copies by sending in your order early.

Use coupon on page 2.

Workers of the World, Unite!

THE MILITANT

PUBLISHED WEEKLY IN THE INTERESTS OF THE WORKING PEOPLE

Vol. XIV - No. 16

NEW YORK, N. Y., MONDAY, APRIL 17, 1950

PRICE: FIVE CENTS

Sound Labor Unity Depends On Action by Rank-and-File

Membership Must Intervene To Assure Fighting Program

By Art Preis

Labor unity has become the No. 1 topic on the agenda of the union movement. CIO President Philip Murray's proposals on unity have received favorable responses from

United Mine Workers President John L. Lewis and International Association of Machinists President A. J. Hayes. AFL President William Green has indicated that he is prepared to recommend favorable consideration at least to that part of Murray's plan looking toward organic merger of the CIO, AFL and independent unions.

Murray's plan calls for the establishment of a standing joint committee, of all the major union organizations, "with authority to embark upon and pursue a common program" of economic, legislative and political action and "also seek to achieve the organic unity of all of American labor."

As Murray states them in his unity call, these are objectives earnestly desired by the American workers. Progressive unionists wholeheartedly agree with Murray's stated aims of achieving "effective unity of action" to combat unemployment, secure passage of civil rights legislation and improved social security and to force repeal of the Taft-Hartley anti-labor law.

If they now appear to be making more serious moves toward unity, it is not through any desire on their part to inspire greater fighting spirit in labor's ranks or to lead a more aggressive and uncompromising mass struggle against labor's enemies. The whole initiative and impulsion toward unity has come from the workers. Their pressure has become so overwhelming that the union officials no longer dare ignore it.

WHAT LEADERS WANT

These union leaders are now rushing to take the lead in the matter of unity precisely because they fear that if they don't, the workers will thrust them aside and push forward to a unity on a militant basis. These union officials are anxious to keep the question of unity exclusively in their own hands and to give it a character and direction that will serve their own bureaucratic interests.

The prime consideration for William Green and the other AFL craft moguls is the organizational advantages they would like to gain for themselves out of a merger between the CIO and the AFL. That is why Green has refused to commit himself on the question of immediate joint action in defense of labor's interests, but continues to insist that "one plan and one purpose should be formulated by one strong, well-established labor organization."

Behind these fine-sounding phrases lies the continuing ambition of the AFL executives to slice up the industrial unions and apportion them out among the numerous craft divisions of the

(Continued on Page 4)



Reutherites Lose Key Posts in Bell Aircraft Election

BUFFALO, April 10 — The Rank and File slate of Bell Aircraft Local 501, UAW-CIO, won a smashing election victory here over the Reutherite incumbents in a contest which attracted wide attention in the local labor movement.

The Rank and File slate headed by Joe Newton, its presidential candidate, and Gaspar Varco, its candidate for top-bargaining committee chairman, defeated Robert Siegler, the Reutherite local president, and Mike Berdych, candidate for top-bargaining chairman. A middle-of-the-road group led by James Schuetz and several others was defeated in the original union election and later threw its support to the Reutherites in the run-offs, but their combined strength was insufficient to beat the Rank and File for the key posts.

The election campaign was closely watched in the Buffalo labor movement because it involved the conduct of last year's strike at Bell Aircraft and the character of the strike settlement. The Siegler group had the full support of the regional office which is led in the area by sub-regional director Ed Gray, the chief architect of the strike policy.

ROTTEN SETTLEMENT

Gray is considered responsible for recommending the bitterly contested strike settlement agreement under whose terms six progressive trade unionists were barred from their jobs as "subversives." Eighteen others were conditionally rehired pending the outcome of criminal indictments against them which arose out of the company's trumped-up charges of strike violence.

The Schuetz group had generally supported the Reutherite position on the strike but balked at the terms of the settlement. They did not, however, go beyond occasional protests and according to the Rank and File group always supported the Reuther group in every important showdown. Schuetz, himself a candidate for president who subsequently withdrew in favor of Siegler after he came out last in the original election, is chairman of the local Socialist Party and

(Continued on page 4)

Truman's Jobless Plan Offers Drop in Bucket

Truman has finally indicated that all is not quite for the best in his best of all capitalist "welfare states." On April 6 he took time out from his fishing and other affairs of state down in Florida to send a message to Congress admitting that unemployment does exist and proposing slight improvements in unemployment compensation standards.

The number of jobless, he conceded, has increased "somewhat," that is, from 2 1/2 million in 1948 to almost 4 1/2 million now. And the number out of work for more than 15 weeks now stands at more than a million, compared to 330,000 two years ago.

Moreover, the prospects for improvement are dim, because "in recent years, up to 1,000,000 more persons have come into the labor market each year, looking for work, than have left the labor market" and "business men have been able to produce more with the same number of workers."

Truman offers no solution for unemployment, which he claims "we cannot, however, completely eliminate." He proposes a palliative limited to a few small changes in the present "states rights"

unemployment compensation set-up.

SMALL-CHANGE PROGRAM

His proposals are the same he has advocated, essentially, since 1946. He would increase the allowances on the average by 20%, from the present \$20 a week average to \$24. He would extend coverage to six million of the present 15 million wage earners not covered by the present law. And he would extend the duration of payments to 26 weeks in all states, instead of the present 13 to 26 weeks range.

What Truman proposes, in essence, is to restore a portion of the unemployment compensation slashed by a 66% rise in the cost of living since the enactment of the present bill. His measure, if approved, would not bring payments even up to the purchasing power of the allowances before the sharp spiral in prices in 1946.

His proposal to standardize duration of payments for 26 weeks would not change the situation in many industrial states, such as New York and Michigan. Truman admits that had his proposal been in effect last year there would still have been more

than a million jobless who would have exhausted their unemployment compensation.

Truman's sudden recognition of the fact of mass unemployment comes from no anxiety over the tragic plight of millions. It has been forced on him by the fact that state after state is beginning to exhaust its unemployment fund reserves and that 25 states already are spending double what they are taking in on payroll taxes to cover the costs. These states are pressing for more funds.

NO ACTION IN CONGRESS

Moreover, Truman is doing nothing to get his program passed by Congress. His own political colleagues in the House and Senate have indicated they do not intend to take action on his proposals, at least not this year. Even if Congress did take favorable action this year, his proposals could not be put into effect until each state legislature takes implementing action. All but one of these state bodies will not meet until 1951.

What the workers need — what they must vigorously demand — is a genuine federal system of

(Continued on page 4)

High Court Bolsters Witch-Hunt

In far-reaching decisions on April 10 the Supreme Court, packed with Truman appointees, dealt new blows to elementary democratic rights in this country. Especially noteworthy was its refusal to review the lower court convictions of John Howard Lawson and Dalton Trumbo. These two Hollywood writers were convicted of contempt of Congress for refusing in 1947, along with eight others whose cases are still pending, to answer questions of the House Un-American Committee concerning their political affiliation.

Only Justices Black and Douglas favored a review (a minimum of four is required). Former Attorney General Tom Clark, under whom the prosecutions of Lawson and Trumbo were conducted, "did not participate."

The Lawson-Trumbo case is of exceptional importance because involved in it, in addition to the

constitutional right to privacy of political opinion, are also the paramount issues of free speech and of the basic rights under the law of each and every defendant.

FLAGRANT VIOLATION

The Appellate Court had ruled that neither the right of free speech nor the "right to remain silent" were absolute. And that Congress has the powers to "abridge either freedom." It was this super-reactionary ruling that has been, in effect, upheld by the Supreme Court's refusal to review the Lawson-Trumbo case.

The Appellate Court decision is in flagrant contradiction with the very first article of the Bill of Rights which specifically prohibits Congress from passing any legislation whatever "abridging the freedom of speech or of the press."

Nor is this all. In addition to endorsing Congress with powers it was never granted constitu-

tionally in the first place, the Appellate Court also cynically disregarded the fact that there is no federal law on the statute books as yet formally "abridging" the rights of any political party or its membership. Evidently, Congress needs no such law.

This is indeed a new doctrine. Only dictatorial and fascist regimes have ever arrogated to themselves such sweeping powers as those implicit in the Appellate Court rulings. But the majority of the Supreme Court has preferred to ignore all this by the cowardly expedient of "refusing to review."

Furthermore, there is no court in the land that is granted the power to compel a defendant to testify against himself. This is an elementary safeguard against ongoing abuses of judicial and police terror and corruption. Yet as the decision now stands, Congress, or more accurately a single congressional committee — the

NAACP PROTESTS STALL ON FEPC IN SENATE

Even Truman's supporters are now beginning to complain publicly about the way in which he is delaying action on the FEPC bill in the U. S. Senate. Among the organizations that have lodged protests with the White House are the NAACP and the ADA.

Last year administration leaders promised that the FEPC would be the first point of business in the Senate this year. But the bill was stalled along from month to month on one pretext after another. Now Truman has decided to postpone it again until after the European Co-operation

Administration bill is passed in the Senate — an action that will probably take several weeks.

Truman's liberal, labor and Negro friends have hitherto been silent about the postponements, which aid the strategy of the Southern Democrats to filibuster the bill to death. After the latest stall, however, acting NAACP secretary Roy Wilkins found it necessary on April 12 to wire Truman for a White House conference with leaders of the Civil Rights Mobilization and to say:

INCREASING RESENTMENT

"Continued delay and evasion on the part of the Democratic leadership in the Senate not only forestalls enactment of this bill but imperils the entire Fair Deal program. . . My recent country-wide tour disclosed everywhere an increasing resentment against the failure of the Democratic leadership to enact the program on which it was elected while giving precedence to special interests legislation, such as the Kerr natural gas bill."

As William E. Bohannon points out in his article on the Florida primaries on Page 3 of this issue, one of the reasons for the delay is the administration's desire not to "embarrass" Senator Pepper's campaign for the Democratic nomination. Pepper is an opponent of compulsory FEPC, and he might lose the Negro vote by voting against it before the May 2 primary in Florida. Negro and liberal leaders, however, have kept quiet about this aspect of the question.

THREAT TO ALL

The same reactionary courts which today sanctify the "abridging" of the basic rights of Stalinists or alleged Stalinists can and surely will attempt tomorrow to "abridge" the rights of all others.

The latest court decisions are just additional proof that the enemies of civil rights have reliable supporters and allies in the capitalist courts, from the lowest up to the Supreme Court itself.

European Notebook

Revolutionist Tells Why He Fled East Germany

By Ernest Germain

In a Western European country we recently met a revolutionary socialist comrade who had escaped from the Soviet occupation zone of Germany. The answers he gave to our questions throw considerable light on the situation facing the labor movement in the "German Democratic Republic."

QUESTION: How do you account for the fact that many revolutionary socialists, former oppositional communists, Trotskyists, Brandierites, KAPD-ites and even Anarchists have occupied in the past few years, and even still occupy, leading posts in the civil administration of the Soviet occupation zone in Germany?

ANSWER: Following the capitulation of May 1945, the Soviet occupation authorities for several months allowed considerable leeway to all political groups willing to accept the Potsdam agreements. Many revolutionary socialists and oppositional communists who were opposed to these agreements considered it as a lesser evil in view of the opportunity to get into immediate activity, in order to achieve a certain number of limited aims: to rebuild the mass organizations, push the agrarian reform, drive the Nazi and nationalist elements out of the administration, and so on.

After long years of captivity, these men wanted above all to "do something." Memories of 1918 and 1933 also played an important role in their arriving at this attitude. There was a genuine desire to unite all the forces claiming to represent the working class. There was a no less genuine desire to "seize" once and for all the key positions in the administrative apparatus, because the defeat of the 1918 revolution was ascribed by them previously to the failure to liquidate at the time the caste of top bourgeois officials.

QUESTION: What led these vanguard elements to change their attitude?

ANSWER: The introduction of rigid control by Soviet occupation authorities over all political, administrative and cultural activities, and the lies and deceptions practiced by these same authorities. Freedom of speech, which actually existed during the first few months, was completely curtailed. Every word published in a periodical, every syllable uttered

on the radio had first to meet with the approval of Russian censorship.

These same censors, as well as the "spetztes" (specialists) of the department of political education, forced the functionaries to become accomplices in all sorts of shady deals. One of my friends, an old world-famous revolutionist, was appointed attorney general of an important province. One of the first demands upon him was that he cover up a case of corruption involving high Stalinist dignitaries. Naturally, he resigned. As editor of a well-known daily paper, I was personally obliged to "celebrate" the nationalization of a large factory in my city by a full page of "statements from workers" which I had to write myself!

I was instructed in particular to stress the fact that the nationalized factory had started producing machinery of vital importance to the city's reconstruction. The next day, the director of this nationalized factory received a visit from a Russian officer who explained to him that the entire output of the machines in question was to be shipped as reparations to Russia. It was then that I decided to escape.

THREE REASONS

QUESTION: You say that this change in Russian attitude has been evident since the end of 1945. How then do you explain the fact that many vanguard elements remained in leading positions up to 1949, and some even up till the present?

ANSWER: This must be chalked up to opportunism, corruption and terror. The opportunist reasons are simple enough: Many honest vanguard elements said to themselves, "after all, by clinging to our responsible posts, we can put some sort of curbs on the evil and in this way improve 'our' administration and the functioning of 'our' factories." As for corruption, that is even simpler: Militants who have known privations all their lives who have behind them 10 years of prisons or concentration camps, are easily influenced by a life which has finally become "normal." Let me give you my own personal experience.

After six months of the occupation, I began to raise complaints about the bureaucratic treatment to which the press was subjected. A Soviet major, in charge of control of the press, summoned me and said: "Comrade X, I don't understand you at all. Why are you complaining? You get a 1,000 marks a month. Your wife also gets a tidy salary. You have a car at your disposal. You can obtain all the supplementary rations you may want. You have a fine apartment. What is it you lack? Would you like a vacation? Would you like to take a trip? Do you want to earn more? Have you perhaps gotten into debt? Are you worried about your family? Tell us what's worrying you, and we'll take care of it right away!"

It did not even enter the thick skull of this bureaucratic underling that a worker militant could be concerned about anything except his own personal affairs. Sad to say, this reflects not only the mentality of the Russian bureaucracy, but also of many old German labor functionaries, worn out after a life of unceasing struggle.

THE "V-SERVICE"

QUESTION: Didn't you also refer to terror?

ANSWER: Of course, and that remains the most important single factor. Thousands of vanguard militants have been disappointed since 1946, and would have preferred to "go back to the ranks" or escape, if they could have done so without too serious risks. But more and more terrorized, they did not dare. And it must be admitted that Stalinist methods of terror are as refined as they are effective.

They have taken over the "V-Service" (V-Service) from the Gestapo. The way this works is by arresting persons on very serious charges involving the

White Reconsiderers, Offers to Remain NAACP Secretary

Walter White last month sent the NAACP Board of Directors a letter stating that he had decided to withdraw his resignation as secretary of the NAACP, submitted last year. Instead of accepting the resignation, the Board had given him a year's leave of absence. White said he had changed his mind because his health has improved and because he prefers the NAACP job to several others he had been offered.

death penalty, and making them sign confessions under torture, and then releasing them with the pledge that they will act as stool-pigeons in such and such an administrative department or workshop or residential district, and so on. These involuntary stool-pigeons must hand in weekly reports to the proper departments of the MVD. If the latter are not satisfied with the reports, the unfortunate spies are again locked up and condemned on the basis of their previously signed confessions.

While visiting a certain town a few days prior to my escape, in order to see some dear friends for the last time, I ran across the sinister Commissioner Dennecke, who used to be chief of the Gestapo's V-Service. Upon inquiring from acquaintances how it was possible for this hangman to be at large, I was told that he now serves as the chief liaison agent between the "People's Police" and the MVD. And that is only one instance among thousands...

OPPOSITION GROUPS

QUESTION: Does this mean that there are no political reasons to explain this passivity of the vanguard in Eastern Germany?

ANSWER: It would be a mistake to look only for purely psychological explanations for the existing attitudes. At bottom, the great majority of oppositional elements who accepted posts in Eastern Germany during 1945-46 never demarcated themselves politically from the Stalinist line ("unity with the other allies," "democratic reconstruction of Germany," etc.) except for their being opposed to the servility of the native Stalinists toward the Russians.

When the "left" turn of the SED was executed, a strong opposition arose, but its political line was to the right of the Stalinists. The vice-president of the party, Gniffke, together with other high officials, fled to the Western occupation zones because they were opposed to abandoning a reformist line. A strong underground Social Democratic organization was quickly formed, but its program was so rightist and its methods so crude that it left the doors wide open to practically any sort of provocation and it was quickly liquidated by the MVD.

Some small oppositional cells on the left came into being at the same time, and many of them continue to function. But these cells lack perspectives. They were obsessed by fears lest in fighting Stalinism they would serve the interests of imperialism. They did not see any possibility of a new rise of the international revolutionary movement.

The break between Yugoslavia and the Kremlin has given them a shot in the arm. Right now, the situation is improving rapidly in favor of the development of underground movements to the left of Stalinism. But as long as the Russian occupation and passivity of the broad masses continue, these movements can be nothing but small cadre organizations, living under the constant threat of repressions.

Letters from Readers

A Question on Civil Rights and Fascists

Editor: In our fight for civil liberties today, we attempt to enlist the support of many liberals, on the campuses particularly. As an average, these people accept capitalism and reject socialism, but nevertheless do not wish to accept that "part" of capitalism that denies civil rights to the underdog.

Their ideas on civil rights are given the fullest expression through the American Civil Liberties Union which maintains that it will fight (in the courts) for the rights of fascists as well as socialists. These same people slake with astonishment when informed that the Socialist Workers Party is "not in favor of granting civil rights to fascists" while it at the same time demands to be immediately removed from the subversive lists and be granted all rights as outlined in the Constitution. This is characterized as hypocrisy on the part of the SWP.

I wish The Militant would print an article clarifying this question. P. M. Oakland, Calif.

ED. NOTE: Reader P. M. is correct in saying that in the struggle for civil rights The Mil-

Why No Mass Protest in Bridges Frame-up

By Joseph Keller

What stands out about the Harry Bridges case is not so much that an obvious frame-up has been perpetrated against a union leader. It is that this frame-up has aroused so little indignation and protest within the labor movement and from liberals who used to pride themselves on their principled defense of civil rights.

Everybody knows that the ship-owners, and government agencies acting in collusion with them, have been attempting to "get" Bridges for 15 years. Every informed person also knows that three previous attempts to victimize Bridges on the basis of his alleged membership in the



HARRY BRIDGES

Communist Party had been overruled by higher judicial agencies, including the U. S. Supreme Court.

The very fact that the trial judge in the latest prosecution emphasized that Bridges had a "fair trial" by jury, that all the capitalist commentators who urged and then hailed his conviction also make much point of the jury trial, indicates how conscious they are of the frame-up color permeating this case. What legal frame-ups have not been sanctioned by verdicts of prejudiced or intimidated jurors?

The mechanism of the Bridges frame-up has been so unceasing, its political motivations so transparent, as to reveal an utmost cynicism and disregard for public opinion on the part of those who directly engineered and carried it through. Why were the government agents so sure of themselves, why were they so certain that they could pull an open frame-up and get little lick-back?

First of all, the general atmosphere had been well prepared by the cold war propaganda and witch-hunt that has spread like a cloud of poison gas over the land. The Bridges case climaxes a whole series of other successful political prosecutions, from the Minneapolis trial of the Socialist Workers Party leaders in 1941 to the Foley Square convictions

of the Communist Party leaders last year.

Secondly, not only did all the highest judicial agencies, from the Department of Justice to the federal courts, surround the Bridges frame-up with the aura of governmental sanction and majesty, but others who should have spoken out loudest against the frame-up were an actual party to it.

AIDED FRAME-UP

The cold-war liberals and union leaders deliberately looked the other way, kept their mouths shut, or gave actual approval to the prosecution. One of the government's stool-pigeons and a key prosecution witness, Mervyn Rathborne, a former CIO official, revealed on the witness stand that CIO President Philip Murray, CIO Secretary-Treasurer James Carey and CIO Vice President Joseph Curran had approved and even encouraged his testifying against Bridges.

The cold war and witch-hunt atmosphere, the conspiracy of the government agencies, supported by the "anti-communist" liberals and union leaders, account for much of the indifference or cynical approval that has greeted this frame-up. But they do not account for all of it.

The Stalinists also have to bear their share of criminal responsibility. They have refused to defend the civil rights of their

working class political opponents. They shouted loudest for the frame-up conviction of the 18 Trotskyists under the Smith Act and openly attempted to sabotage the great movement of labor defense organized on behalf of the 18. To this day, they oppose civil rights for Trotskyists and oppose the defense of the legless veteran, James Kutcher, who was fired from his government job for his socialist views.

Bridges himself joined the Stalinist pack in the unions who howled for the imprisonment of the Trotskyists during the war. He has not lifted a finger in defense of the civil rights of his political opponents in the labor movement. And he and the Stalinists earned the well-merited contempt of labor militants by their treacherous strikebreaking and support for the speed-up during the war.

Moreover, the Stalinists, who yell so loudly for civil rights for themselves in this country, have hailed and defended the monstrous frame-ups and murders of hundreds of thousands of working class revolutionists and political opponents of Stalinism in the Soviet Union and the satellite countries. This has certainly won no sympathy for them when they are framed up by the capitalist courts of this country.

But what is involved in the Bridges case, and in all other assaults on the civil rights of

Stalinists or Stalinist sympathizers, is not a matter of personal sympathy for them. It is not Bridges that concerns us. It is civil rights — the civil rights of everyone.

WHO WILL BE SAFE?

If Bridges, a union leader, can be framed up with impunity, without any general protest, what other union member or leader is safe if he dares to disagree with the government's policies? Will the frame-up system stop with Stalinists? Remember, before Bridges, there were other frame-ups — the judicial victimization of decent and honorable fighters for labor like Mooney and Billings, Sacco and Vanzetti and the Minneapolis 18. The Bridges case will set a further precedent for working class fighters like these, and not just for Stalinists.

That is why we Trotskyists, who understand better than all others the perfidy and crimes of Stalinism, nevertheless unconditionally defend the Stalinists' civil rights and call on the whole labor movement to do likewise. We point to the indifference that has greeted the Bridges frame-up as a grave danger to civil rights. And we urge a new awakening of the spirit of labor solidarity in this country and a mobilization of all true defenders of civil rights for united action on behalf of all victims of the witch-hunt.

BELGIAN LABOR BLOCKS KING LEOPOLD'S RETURN

By Charles Hanley

After the Belgian referendum, the parliament was supposed to vote on whether King Leopold should return or not. But so far, there has been no parliamentary vote

pressure, without organizing and extending them, without preparing for an all-out effort to smash the enemies of the workers, whose neo-fascist provocations are becoming increasingly bolder.

Instead of spreading republican, anti-monarchist and anti-capitalist slogans, the reformist bureaucrats keep claiming to be the best defenders of the monarchic Constitution and of capitalist legality. Without gaining favor in the eyes of the capitalists, they only weaken the workers' united front by these treacherous tactics.

Will the reformist leaders once again betray the Belgian workers? Or will the workers succeed in forcing their leaders to go forward, strengthening their defense by organizing rank and file committees to lead the struggle and building up a workers militia? As things stand right now, the Socialist and trade union leaders would completely lose their prestige by capitulating to the bourgeoisie. Nor can they expect many favors from the bourgeoisie by such a capitulation. Spaak and other reformist leaders unquestionably prefer a "face saving" compromise solution and are simply at a loss to find one.

The greatest vigilance must be exercised by the Belgian workers, above all, against their own cowardly and treacherous leaders. Their struggle assumes great importance today, for its outcome will either encourage or discourage the forces of capitalist reaction in all of Western Europe.

The Belgian experience demonstrates that what is decisive in the situation is not what happens in the Chamber or Senate but the actual course of the class struggle, the resolute resistance the workers are putting up against reaction. Had this resistance faltered or weakened, Leopold would have returned long ago.

The real danger lies in the false policy of the Socialist leaders who seek to use the spontaneous actions of the working class simply as a means of

'Times' Editors Slip Up, Expose Own Censorship

There is a hidden and rigid censorship of the allegedly "free press" proscribing in particular even the mildest criticism of the Catholic hierarchy and of Roman Catholicism generally. This was inadvertently exposed when N. Y. Times on Apr. 8 carried an editorial apology ("A Correction") and at the same time publicly castigated its own Book Section editor for not having deleted "a reference to Roman Catholics that obviously should not have been made."

This "offending reference" was made in a book review in the same issue by Philip Toynbee, a young British critic. Reviewing a recent book on literary criticism, Toynbee remarked in passing: "We are all too familiar with facile and vitriolic attacks on liberal and democratic culture made by Roman Catholics and members of the political right. Their furious partisanship, their tiresome love of paradox, has produced little criticism of importance." Even this typical British understatement of the role of Roman Catholic literary critics is "not fit to print" so far as the N. Y. Times is concerned!

THE MILITANT ARMY

Our Buffalo subgetters would probably prefer something besides hard blows on which to thrive. They have had more than their full share for some time, even the daily papers singling them out for attack in the local witch-hunt, and so they decided to do the best they could with what was available.

Despite unemployment, strike losses and the difficulties created by cruel red-baiting, they launched a subscription campaign for The Militant. In the past four weeks our records show they've sent in 48 subscriptions.

We cite our records because the Militant Army publicity department in Buffalo appears to be a casualty in the struggle and all we know about the campaign is that "the recent UAW articles from Michigan in The Militant proved instrumental in obtaining some of the subs."

A total of 48 subs under the circumstances is an excellent showing, we think. The Buffalo Trotskyists are showing that they know how to absorb punishment and grow stronger in the process

Cochran Analyzes Labor's Problems at N.W. Meetings

MINNEAPOLIS, April 5 — Minnesota friends of Bert Cochran said goodbye to him this morning as he left for Seattle, and wished him as successful a stay in the remaining stops on his tour as he had in the Twin Cities.

The largest and most important meeting which Cochran, trade union chairman of the Socialist Workers Party, addressed was Sunday afternoon, when he spoke on "The Outlook for Labor in 1950—The Mine Workers' Victory: What Next?" The state headquarters of the Minnesota SWP was filled to capacity to hear the visiting speaker's talk.

"There's never been a previous period in American history when the American capitalist masters have been as dependent on the labor bureaucracy as they are now," Cochran said. That is so, he added, because the labor movement has held on to its basic organizational structure.

"The workers achieved trade union consciousness in the great CIO upsurge," he asserted, "and the workers will, in the next wave of struggles, achieve a political class consciousness which will produce leaders to work, not only for the temporary amelioration of wrongs, but for the liberation of the people from capitalism."

Yesterday afternoon, the Civil Liberties Club of the University of Minnesota sponsored a meeting where Cochran spoke on "Labor and Civil Rights." Last night he addressed a Twin City SWP membership meeting. On Saturday, a welcoming social was held in St. Paul.

SEATTLE, April 7 — Bert Cochran, chairman of the Trade Union Committee of the Socialist Workers Party, today outlined to an attentive audience the tasks and perspectives of the American labor movement.

Another bright spot on the sub-getting map is Seattle. For many months the Seattle comrades have demonstrated how consistent, day-by-day attention to sub-getting possibilities pays off in increased circulation of the paper.

Now they are shooting for the goal of "One sub a month per comrade." First results are in line with expectations, according to Literature Agent Marianne Stanley. She reports that J. B. is already well ahead of the slogan with 10 subs to his credit within the past few weeks.

J. B. chalked up those results on the campaign — an indication of what can be done among students who are beginning to feel what a dark future capitalism offers.

Los Angeles is likewise putting some red pins in the city map. Literature Agent Bert Deck reports 31 subs so far in the local campaign, and a decision to make it 60 by the end of the month.

And Detroit too is out in front with 38 subs in the past month despite the heavy petition work in the election campaign. Shirley Mason writes that the Detroit comrades have decided to extend their campaign for subscriptions to The Militant "and we will do what we can as we go along."

Local Addresses Of Socialist Workers Party

- AKRON—For information, write P.O. Box 1348.
- BOSTON—Worker-Educational Center, 30 Stuart St., open Wed. 5:30-9:00 p.m., social last Sat. of month.
- BUFFALO—Militant Forum, 625 Main St., 2nd fl. Phone Madison 3960. Every afternoon except Sun.
- CHICAGO—108 W. Washington Street, Rm. 312-314. Phone Dearborn 2-4751.
- CLEVELAND—Every Sunday, 9 p.m., Pecks Hall, 1446 E. 82nd St. (off Wade Pk. Ave.)
- DETROIT—6108 Linwood Ave. Phone TY 7-6267, Mon. through Sat., 12-5 p.m.
- ELINT—Socialist Workers Party Hall, 215 East Ninth Street, Phone: 2-2495. Open every Friday evening.
- LOS ANGELES—Militant Pub. Assn., Room 225, 124 W. 6th St. Phone Vandyke 8661.
- LYNN, (Mass.)—Militant Pub. Assn., 44 Central Ave., office open Tues., Wed. 7:30-9:30 p.m.
- MILWAUKEE—817 N. 3rd St., 3rd fl. Mon. through Fri., 7:30-9:30 p.m. Phone Hopkins 2-5337.
- MINNEAPOLIS—10 So. 4th St. Phone Main 7781. Daily except Sun., 10 a.m.-8 p.m. Library, bookstore.
- NEW HAVEN—For information write, P.O. Box No. 1019.
- NEWARK—423 Springfield Ave.
- NEW YORK CITY (HQ.)—118 University Place, Phone GR 5-8148.
- HARLEM—108 W. 110 St., Rm. 23. Phone MO 2-1868. Open discussion Thurs., 8 p.m.
- BROOKLYN—Mandell's Manor, 343 Pennsylvania Ave., off Sutter, meetings every Thurs. evening at 8.
- CHESTER—130 W. 23rd St. Phone AL 6-5485.
- OAKLAND (Cal.)—For information, phone Templebar 2-8183 or Templebar 3-3725, or write P. O. Montak, 908-B Cypress St., Oakland 7.
- PHILADELPHIA—1303-05 W. Girard Ave., 2nd fl., Phone Stevenson 4-5820. Open every Friday evening.
- SAN FRANCISCO—1729 Fillmore Ave., 4th fl., Phone FI 6-0410. Daily except Sun., 12-4:30 p.m.
- ST. LOUIS—For information, phone PR 5305.
- SEATTLE—Maynard Bldg., 1st Ave., R. 201, So. & Washington, Tel. Main 9278. Mon. through Sat., 12-5 p.m. Branch meeting Tues. 7:30 p.m. Library, bookstore.
- TOLEDO—Address inquiries to Socialist Workers Party, P.O. Box 1502, Toledo 3.
- WORCESTER, (Mass.)—For information write P.O. Box 354, Worcester.
- YOUNGSTOWN—234 E. Federal St., Phone 3-1355, Wed., Fri., Sat., 1:30 to 4 p.m.

CELEBRATE May Day WITH The Militant

Special May Day edition will feature:

● A manifesto by the Political Committee of the Socialist Workers Party on unemployment, the H-Bomb war danger, civil rights struggle and labor's tasks of the day.

● In commemoration of the Haymarket martyrs, a speech by Albert Parsons and an article "Red-baiting and Witch-hunting — Then and Now."

● "Germany and International Solidarity — May Day 1950" by Ernest Germain.

● "Why Capitalism Doesn't Work" and "Why Socialism Will." Hard facts in language anybody can understand.

● An exposure of the false theories and traitorous practices of the Stalinists and social-democrats.

● Leon Trotsky answers Dean Acheson. Latest arguments of the Secretary of State taken to pieces long ago by the founder of the Fourth International.

● Special treatment of the struggle for Negro equality, the issues looming in the 1950 election campaign and other topics of vital interest.

A real round-up of the situation facing the American workers on May Day 1950 and what to do about it!

Order extra copies for your friends. 3c a copy in bundles of five or more. Orders must be in by April 20.

The Militant
116 University Place
New York 3, N. Y.
Enclosed is \$ Send me
copies of the special May Day edition.

Name
Street
City
State Zone

Subscriptions: \$3 per year; \$1 for 6 months. Foreign: \$3.50 per year; \$2 for 6 mos. Entered as second class matter Mar. 7, 1944 at the Post Office at New York N. Y., under the act of Mar. 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 4-9330)
 Editor: GEORGE BREITMAN
 Business Manager: JOSEPH HANSEN

Single Copies (10 or more copies): 50 each in U.S., 44 each in foreign countries. Signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent The Militant's policies. These are expressed in its editorials.

Vol. XIV - No. 16

Monday, April 17, 1950



TROTSKY

"The ruling class forces its ends upon society and habituates it into considering those means which contradict its ends as immoral. That is the chief function of official morality. It pursues the idea of the 'greatest possible happiness' not for the majority but for a small and ever diminishing minority. Such a regime could not have endured even for a week through force alone. It needs the cement of morality. The production of this cement constitutes the profession of the petty bourgeois theoreticians and moralists. They radiate all the colors of the rainbow but in the final analysis remain apostles of slavery and submission."

— Leon Trotsky, "Their Morals and Ours," 1938.



LENIN

Tito on the War Question

In an "informal conversation" in Belgrade on April 5, Marshal Tito is reported to have said regarding the cold war and the possibilities for world peace:

"Given the will on both sides to avoid it — and there is such a will, for the people know the consequences of war — I see no reason why war should arise. The agreements over Germany and Austria are going slowly and with difficulty, but this cold war can only last for a year or two more. The cold war must be solved some day and I think it is more likely to be solved in the peaceful way than by war, because peace is the least expensive way. A hot war is unlikely to replace a cold war." (Dispatch to *London Times*, reprinted in the *N. Y. Times*, April 8.)

If Tito really believes this, then it is a clear case of wishful thinking. The cold war may not be followed by an immediate hot war; as we have often pointed out, a temporary deal may yet be reached between Washington and Moscow. But even a deal of this kind will not usher in a period of lasting peace; at best, it will be an uneasy truce, with each side continuing to maneuver for positions for the showdown that is inevitable unless the socialist revolution intervenes first.

And even if a deal is reached, it won't be for the reason given by Tito — that "peace is the least expensive way." War is always more expensive than peace, but never in the history of capitalism has that fact prevented the outbreak of war by powers who began to believe that the postponement of war operated to the

advantage only of their rivals. Tito's remarks represent a hangover from Stalinist ideology and are in conflict with Leninism, which shows that war is inherent in capitalism and unavoidable under imperialism.

Regardless of the reasons for Tito's statement, it does not contribute toward the task of mobilizing the international labor support without which, in the final analysis, Yugoslavia's struggle for independence cannot be successful. How can you arouse the workers of the world to come to the aid of Yugoslavia when you tell them at the same time that there is little likelihood of the war that constitutes the greatest menace to its survival?

Nothing could be more harmful than the acceptance of the notion that Yugoslavia's independence can be assured through the consummation of a deal between Stalin and Truman. For one of the prime conditions of such a deal would surely be the demand that Yugoslavia be turned over to the Kremlin's tender mercies — a proposition Truman would not hesitate for a minute to accept if he felt it would serve American imperialist interests.

Yugoslavia cannot be saved by wishful thinking or by statements that tend to minimize the tremendous dangers facing Yugoslavia from both camps in the cold war. It can be saved only by a revolutionary internationalist policy, based on opposition to both imperialism and Stalinism and directed toward the workers of all countries.

The Lay-Offs in Coal

When the coal miners went out on strike, the mine owners howled bloody murder about a "coal shortage." Truman announced a "national emergency" and invoked a Taft-Hartley injunction against the United Mine Workers.

But in just three full weeks of production after the end of the strike, coal stockpiles rose so high that the coal operators began laying off thousands of miners. In Pennsylvania alone, 3,000 were laid off in the first month after the strike. A. H. Raskin, in the April 3 *N. Y. Times*, reported that mine owners predict 50,000 soft coal miners will be "displaced" by mid-summer. Another informed journalist, Joseph C. Harsh, of the *Christian Science Monitor*, reported a drastic decline in coal production and declared that "the cutback is already under way."

Once more the miners are faced with the problem that has harried them since before the first World War — job insecurity and unemployment. Every improvement in productivity that has meant more millions in profits for the mine owners has meant suffering and tragedy for miners and their families. From 1948 to the end of 1949 alone, the number of employed soft-coal miners fell from 441,631 to 375,000.

When the coal miners tried to save their jobs by introducing a three-day week, the government called it an "unfair labor practice" and enjoined it. But when the coal operators fire coal miners and cut production to keep prices and profits up, we don't hear any complaint from Washington. That's "free enterprise" — that's capitalism.

The miners will not be able to meet this problem — which is going to grow ever worse — so long as the industry remains in the hands of cut-throat private owners. A more far-reaching and fundamental solution is required. That solution entails, first of all, the elimination of the profit motive and capitalist mismanagement and disorganization.

There is no way out for the miners short of the nationalization of the mines under the control of the workers themselves. This is the beginning of any real solution of the miners' problems. They themselves must run the industry under a national plan that will safeguard the interests of the men who dig in the pits, that will reduce the hours of labor to conform to rising productivity without cutting earnings and that will provide ample fuel at low cost to the consuming public.

Pension Plans--A Comparison

By Robert Phillips

Four years ago, the coal miners, in a magnificent battle against the coal barons and their government henchmen, won a non-contributory welfare and retirement plan, financed by a 5c per ton levy on each ton of coal mined. Since then, the royalty has been increased, by dint of hard-fought struggles, to 30c per ton. This plan has been the beacon for spreading the principle that workers who slave for a life time for the bosses should be provided for in their old-age and not be made to live solely on miserable state assistance and federal social security handouts.

The coal miners have set a pattern, it is universally admitted, for other unions to follow. In the years since 1946, millions of additional workers have been covered in contract agreements by pension plans.

But in nearly every plan the companies, with the knowing agreement of union bureaucrats like Murray and Reuther, have included clauses in their settlements which make most plans a caricature of the UMW agreement.

However, Philip Murray agreed to alternative plans at Inland Steel and allowed the corporation to propagandize for a contributory plan. Some AFL bureaucrats, following their usual policy of close collaboration with the employers, have agreed to the phony contributory plans. For example: "Just recently, one AFL local negotiated a contributory plan even though the employer had a non-contributory plan for eight years." (Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co., Pension Bulletin, March 1950.)

In the Ford agreement, Reuther agreed to allow the company to retire workers after they reach the age of 68. At Bethlehem Steel, Murray permits the company the option to retire the worker any time after he reaches 65. In the UMW plan, a coal miner retires voluntarily, the company having no say as to when he should retire.

WORK AFTER RETIREMENT
 The International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (AFL) forces the retired worker to stay retired by stating that he is "not to perform any electrical work of any kind either for compensation or gratis for anyone." The joint board of the ILGWU and the dress employers have the right to cancel a worker's pension "in the event the worker has, after retirement, engaged in any other gainful employment." These are particularly onerous requirements since the maximum pension the workers receive under the above plan is \$50 a month!

AMOUNT OF PENSIONS
 Almost invariably, current pension plans are tied to the totally inadequate federal social security payments. At Ford, the maximum benefit for a worker with 30 years continuous service is \$100 per month, including social security. The Amalgamated Clothing Workers have set pension payments by the companies at an amount equal to federal old-age insurance payments; the steel plans set a minimum of \$100 per month, including social security for workers with 25 years service. Once again, the UMW stands out—\$100 a month pension, in addition to social security benefits, to all UMW members with 20 years service in the industry.

CONTRIBUTORY VS. NON-CONTRIBUTORY
 The corporations have naturally insisted on plans in which the workers must contribute a certain proportion of their wage for their future pensions. Under this type of scheme, the small number of workers who were covered by the former U.S. Steel contributory plan, averaged \$9.33 upon retirement. In few of the plans today has this employer line of reasoning been accepted and most plans are non-contributory.

CONTINUOUS SERVICE
 A whole series of conditions are attached to the plans in the steel industry under which workers are forced to meet certain requirements in order to establish continuous service, e.g., at Carnegie-Illinois and Republic Steel, a worker must be re-employed within six months after being laid off to prevent a break in service; he must report within 5 to 14 days after being recalled to the job, etc.

"Vesting" is the principle by which a worker is transferred pension rights prior to his normal retirement age. Few plans provide for this right for workers. In failing to do so, they thereby tie a worker, if he wants his pension upon retirement, almost as effectively to his job as the infamous labor passport system in the USSR.

A Ford worker must be employed for 30 years with Ford, not 25 at Ford and 5 at GM, to receive his pension. The same is true of all the agreements in the steel and rubber industries. Here too, the UMW leads the way—to get his pension on retirement, a coal miner must have 20 years service in the INDUSTRY and not in any one company.

The Toledo Area Plan of the UAW is another step in this direction. It would allow workers to take their pension credits with them from company to company in the Toledo region.

All plans should force the corporations to agree to immediate vesting whenever and for whatever reason a worker leaves his job and should steer clear of phony formulas which set up minimum requirements before a worker is allowed to take his pension credits with him.

FUNDING
 The struggle for adequate funding is crucial to the operation of any pension plan. The employers have no desire to set aside large sums of money to cover workers upon retirement. On the one hand, they have spread the alarm that the pension plans would burden the economy to the tune of many billions of dollars annually. On the other hand, they state that as little as 3c per hour per worker (Chrysler) is adequate to cover workers' pensions.

The first lie was nailed by an authoritative Big Business representative, the Bankers Trust Company, which stated recently that all private pension plans today cost about \$1.2 billion annually and are expected to rise to no more than \$1.7 billion (less than .8% of the national income) by the end of 1950 and this for an expected total of 11 million workers. On the second point, an official of the Equitable Life Assurance Company esti-

imated, that on the most conservative basis, a pension plan should be expected to cost no less than 12c per hour per worker.

The danger that many plans will prove to be cruel delusions will become apparent when the funds set aside (6c per hour in Steel, 7c per hour at Nash, 8½c per hour at Ford) may prove to be far too inadequate to pay out even the meager pensions agreed to.

ADMINISTRATION OF PLAN
 Although joint union-company boards are provided in most plans for administration of the details of operation, the worst retreat of all has been on the question of the funding provision. In nearly all of the steel agreements, Murray has left the companies free to determine their own funding methods. At Ford, the company has the sole discretion in funding, despite the smokescreen over the 8½c per hour company contribution.

The UMW, however, keeps its eyes on the purse strings by assuming full charge of funding, as well as administration. The union here can immediately detect danger signs and act accordingly.

MODIFICATION AND DURATION
 In most of the steel agreements Murray agreed not to ask the "company to increase contribu-

tions or wages to pay the cost of benefits under the plan, or that the plan be changed or a new plan established" and that strikes would not be called to force any changes. Agreements in the steel industry have been signed for 5 years, with no modification in the first two years of operation. The same 5 year frozen-type agreement was made at Ford and at ALCOA. Contrast this with the UMW provision—that the Welfare and Retirement plan sets up an irrevocable fund "to endure as long as the purposes for its creation exist." Yet other agreements, such as the ones signed by the Building Trades Council and Owens-Corning Fiberglas, the UE and Sperry Gyroscope, the Paper Workers and Consolidated Paper, state that the companies have the "right to terminate the plans at any time" in their discretion.

During the last depression, 45 pension plans were unilaterally terminated by various private employers. With the weak provisions of most of the present plans, the corporations will again be tempted at first signs of a recession to cut their costs at the weakest link—pension plans.

There is only one way to eliminate this prospect and that is by demanding that all pension plan provisions, administration, funding, eligibility, vesting, etc., must be placed under union control.

LEON BLUM -- 'SAVIOR' OF FRENCH EMPLOYERS

By John F. Petrone

The capitalist press in this country printed long obituaries on Leon Blum when the leader of the French Socialist Party and three-times Premier of France died. The Social Democratic press printed eulogies, and in New York City a memorial meeting, held under the auspices of the CIO, AFL, Jewish Daily Forward, Jewish Labor Committee and Workers' Circle, listened to tributes by Warren R. Austin, Matthew Woll, David Dubinsky, William J. Donovan, Henry Morgenthau and Alexander Kahn.

But none of these articles or speeches told the real story of Leon Blum which, in its essence, is a story of how the Social Democracy, in collaboration with Stalinism, fully betrayed the socialist aspirations of the French working class.

Alarmed by the growth of fascism both at home and abroad, the French working class began to move rapidly to the left beginning in 1934. To divert this revolutionary sentiment into safe, capitalist channels, the Socialist and Communist parties joined with the capitalist Radicals to form the People's Front. The masses, taking seriously the socialist and communist professions of the Social Democratic and Stalinist leaders, swept them into power in the election of April 26 and May 3, 1936. Blum became Premier for the first time, and although the Stalinists did not join the cabinet, they were its most vigorous apologists among the workers.

THE REVOLUTIONARY UPSURGE OF 1936

Signifying that they wanted a revolutionary transformation of society, the workers immediately launched a vast wave of sit-down strikes and hoisted the red flag over the factories which they had occupied. According to the *N. Y. Times*, there were 12,142 such strikes during the month of June 1936 alone.

The French Trotskyists, characterizing this mass upheaval as the beginning of a revolutionary movement that could topple capitalism and establish a workers and farmers government, called on the workers to form Soviets as a means for achieving this goal. Blum's government responded to this proposal by suppressing the Trotskyist paper and imprisoning its editors for "conspiring against the state."

But while Blum moved with brutal measures against the Trotskyists, he refused to take a single step against the capitalist system. "The country has given its mandate to the People's Front," he said, "and we cannot go beyond the limits of this mandate." The workers understood the mandate they had given to Blum to be a mandate for socialism, but Blum refused to recognize what they wanted.

Instead of revolutionary measures, therefore, he launched a program of reforms — the 40-hour week, vacations with pay and other small-change "New Deal" measures. This program was designed to calm down the workers, get them to leave the factories and dissuade them from the idea even though they had the power to abolish capitalism.

The capitalist class, panic-stricken by the revolutionary energy and combativity of the workers, hid behind Blum and bided their time. When the revolutionary wave had subsided, they kicked Blum aside and went ahead to re-cement their rule. Thus was destroyed one of the greatest opportunities for revitalizing the European revolutionary movement.

Blum's betrayal was deliberate and conscious. In 1942 he admitted as much at the Riom "war guilt" trial when he was tried by the Vichy regime for having contributed to the German victory in 1940. Denying that the 40-hour week reforms of 1936 had weakened France, he reminded the court that in 1936 France had been plunged into a situation that was "not pre-revolutionary but practically revolutionary."

ADMISSIONS AT THE RIOM TRIAL

"By his attitude at the time of taking power [in 1936] when in the spirit of a republican Minister he kept his election promises but restrained striking workers, M. Blum took credit for having saved France from civil war, which, he said at the time, was a far more imminent threat than that of war with Germany." (Dispatch from Riom in *N. Y. Times*, March 11, 1942.)

Boasting that he had carried out tasks the capitalists were unable to perform, he recalled that his program for stopping the strike wave and evacuating occupied factories had been highly acceptable to the big employers' associations. "At the time certain elements among the employers regarded me as their savior," he added proudly.

The obituaries and eulogies hailed Blum for his devotion to democracy and his opposition to totalitarianism; the Social Democrats and labor leaders singled out his hatred for "communism" as his leading virtue. But the real "service" for which he will be remembered was his role as savior of the employers and their system. And in the interests of historical justice, it is necessary to add that it was above all the collaboration of the Stalinists with Blum in the People's Front that made possible his greatest "achievement" — the quelling of the incipient French revolution whose success might have prevented World War II and the suffering and havoc that have been visited on the world since then.

KREMLIN AGENTS CONTINUE PURGES IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA AND NORWAY

On Oct. 25, 1949 Peter Furubotn, national secretary of the Norwegian Communist Party, was expelled, along with several other members of the Central Committee, including Hal Vorse, Vetlesen and Egil Hero and others.

The official explanation for this wholesale purge was finally provided in the Feb. 3 issue of the *Cominform* paper, *For a Lasting Peace, For People's Democracy*.

It suddenly turns out that the entire policy of the Norwegian CP "from 1942 to the end of the war" was laid down "personally" by Furubotn and was "nationalistic." "The interests of the party were subordinated to the 'interests of the nation.'" Furubotn is accused of having dissolved party combat units in wartime "or what amounts to the same thing, subordinated them to the Government-in-Exile in London." It is then stated that:

"Furubotn desired to build a resistance movement exclusively against the Germans, not rallying the working class and the advanced democrats against the reactionary leadership of the resistance but seeking unity with the government in London . . . which corresponded entirely with the war aims of the Norwegian bourgeoisie. . . . After the war, Furubotn launched the slogan 'Production Comes First! No Strikes! . . . When the workers demanded wage raises, he rejected their demands as the work of provocateurs . . . which resulted in the intensified exploitation of the workers in the interests of the nation!'"

In brief, Furubotn is condemned for having followed a policy which, as everybody knows, the Kremlin imposed on all the Communist parties from 1941 to 1947. With customary cynicism Stalin's agents now denounce Stalin's own policy in Norway as the "personal policy of Furubotn."

The list of denunciations against Furubotn and his faction is capped off by the charge of their having ties with Tito.

It may be more than a coincidence that the actual terms in which Furubotn has been condemned apply rather closely to the policy followed under Thorez in France from 1944 to 1947 and that the Cominform representative at the Special Conference of the Norwegian CP which expelled Furubotn was Etienne Fajon, reportedly a personal enemy of Thorez, who has been playing a more and more dominant role inside the French CP in recent months.

After a long delay the Czechoslovak press has finally made public a summary of the recent deliberations of the Central Committee of the Czechoslovak Communist Party. These official reports confirm that a sweeping purge in the ranks of the party and of the government has been in progress.

In the main report delivered by Kopriva to the CP Central Committee considerable emphasis was placed on "grave Titoist deviations." Kopriva confirmed the removal from his post of Wiler Nouy, former editor in chief of *Rude Pravo*, central newspaper of the Czech CP and former chairman of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the National Assembly. Nouy has also been expelled from the party. The charge against him were "lack of revolutionary vigilance" and the transmission of many secret reports to a "foreigner." (It is rumored that this "foreigner" is the American Noel Field, who has been accused of being a spy and about whose fate there has been no news since last summer.)

Kopriva also threw some light on the mysterious disappearance of Milan Reiman, former chief of Zapotocky's cabinet. Reiman is alleged to have "been in the habit" of demanding important documents and plans in the name of Prime Minister Zapotocky and without the latter's instructions or knowledge. "These documents," said Kopriva, "were in no way connected with Reiman's functions as chief of the Prime Minister's cabinet. When asked for explanations of his conduct, Reiman committed suicide."

Kopriva also dwelt on the recent discovery of several groups "who have been serving as the agents of Titoist treason." They are alleged to have received instructions from the Yugoslav Minister Rankovich to "introduce in the country the system of Tito calculated to subject us to the agents of Tito and to Anglo-American imperialism."

Rumors continue to emanate that the current purge is a prelude to the staging of a "treason trial" after the Hungarian and Bulgarian pattern. Among the main defendants and scapegoats mentioned are the American Field and Vladimir Clementis, an old member of the party who has been recently removed from his post as Minister of Foreign Affairs.



LEON BLUM

Sen. Pepper--A Typical Southern Liberal

By William E. Bohannon
 SWP Candidate for Congress,
 11th District, N. J.

Since only one party ever wins in Florida, as in the other Southern states, the question of who will be the next U. S. Senator from Florida will be settled in the Democratic primary on May 2 instead of in the general election next November. And the most interesting aspect of this hotly-contested primary fight is not who will win the nomination but the light it throws on the nature of the political policies of the trade union and Negro leaders on a national scale.

The incumbent Senator is Claude Pepper, a glib demagogue with whom the Stalinists flirted for several years until the cold war got under way in real earnest. The labor bureaucrats support him enthusiastically because he advocates repeal of the Taft-

Hartley Act. Henry Lee Moon, public relations director of the NAACP, recently singled him out in a *New Leader* article as an example of the kind of "decent candidate" whose election "could result within a decade in a complete regeneration of Southern politics."

His opponent, Rep. George A. Smathers, who appears to have the advantage in the primary at present, is also a demagogue, but without the "liberal" veneer. Briefly stated, his campaign speeches show him to be a combination of McCarthy and Dewey, heavily crossed with Rankin.

PEPPER'S "LIBERALISM"

Because the election is expected to be close, special interest hinges on the Negro voters, who constitute about 10% of the 1,000,000 registered Democrats, and on the labor vote. It seems that both these groups are in the

Pepper camp, and Pepper is trying to keep them there.

Thus, in a speech in Tallahassee he condemned his opponents as "those who would stir up racial and religious hatreds in order to gain votes" and swore that he would "never appeal to bigotry and prejudice to attempt to get votes." (Florida Times-Union, April 3.) It is statements like this that give him his reputation for liberalism.

But what kind of "liberal" is he? In the South, especially, the Negro question serves as the perfect test. Over and over again Pepper denies that he is in favor of a compulsory FEPC bill, and promises he will continue to oppose it if re-elected. He is extremely apologetic about having voted during the war to continue an appropriation for the temporary FEPC. In every speech he reminds his audience: "I don't believe in social equality" for Negroes. When hostile papers print-

ed a picture of him shaking hands with a Negro woman, he howled like a stuck pig that he was the victim of a "frame-up."

It would be wrong to think that Pepper is getting the backing of labor and Negro leaders only in Florida. Last year Truman's Senate leader, Lucas, promised to bring the FEPC bill up as the first point on the 1950 agenda; he didn't keep this promise and he has been stalling off Senate action on the bill ever since; now he has informed the Negro and labor leaders that he does not intend to bring it up until after the Florida primary is over because he doesn't want to "embarrass" Pepper's chances in the campaign.

NORTHERN "PEPPERS"

The leaders of the Civil Rights Mobilization have not uttered a single word of protest against this business, which plays into the hands of the filibuster gang's

strategy. Pepper is their "friend" too.

This should not come as a surprise to anyone. Their subservience to the Democratic Party has led the labor and Negro bureaucrats to support people like Pepper in all parts of the country; the only difference is that the Northern "Peppers" put on a bigger and better "liberal" act than their Southern counterparts.

The real victims of a "frame-up" in this situation are the white and Negro workers of Florida, and the workers in the rest of the country who will have to suffer from the way the Peppers vote in Congress. And the only way for the workers and Negro people to put an end to this political skulduggery is by repudiating the policies of their leaders and getting together to form a party of their own that will run candidates on a program truly in their own interests.

The Roosevelt "Legacy"

By Fred Hart

The April 9 Worker, Sunday paper of the Communist Party, devotes two whole pages in an attempt to show that the Stalinists are the sole rightful heirs of "the Roosevelt legacy." To be sure, there are other claimants to the inheritance. But, since Roosevelt left no political will that could be probated in the courts, the Stalinists feel safe in making their grab for Roosevelt's mantle. He, at least, won't protest.

The "Roosevelt legacy," the Worker claims, is above all "the grand design of Soviet-American friendship." If he were alive today, how different everything would be — no cold war but "the peaceful coexistence of capitalist America and the socialist world."

Didn't Roosevelt form a military alliance with the Kremlin after Hitler invaded the Soviet Union? Didn't he make a deal with Stalin and Churchill at Teheran and Yalta to stake out Europe and Asia between the victorious powers? Didn't he declare on Dec. 24, 1943, that he "got along fine" with Stalin at Teheran and that the Kremlin totalitarianism was "truly representative of the heart and soul of Russia; and I believe we are going to get along well with him and the Russian people. . . ."

There were, the Stalinists now concede, instances when Roosevelt "could not escape his class position in society" — as when he placed the embargo on the shipment of arms to Loyalist Spain and thereby aided Franco. But even if "capitalism. . . was still capitalism, therefore predatory and anti-Soviet," Roosevelt rose above the system he represented to conduct a "progressive" war.

In this, of course, the Stalinists attempt to justify their own support of American imperialism in its "non-imperialist" war and to give a tip-off to the American capitalist rulers that the Stalinists are prepared to give them a "progressive" label again any time they make a deal with the Kremlin.

One curious omission is the period of the Stalin-Hitler pact and the Soviet-Finnish war. How could the Worker simply forget that period when the Stalinist press daily called Roosevelt everything from an "imperialist warmonger" to a "fascist" and Roosevelt led the pack in mobilizing anti-Soviet hostility and aid for "poor little Finland"?

Naturally, if Roosevelt embodied the principle of the "peaceful coexistence" of capitalist states and workers states, he likewise demonstrated the possibility of the "peaceful coexistence" of the capitalist class and the working class in the United States. Another article in the Worker, tells why Roosevelt "warranted the support of labor, the small farmers, the Negro, the middle classes and those elements of business opposed to fascism and monopoly."

Here, also curiously enough, the Stalinists omit the fact that not a single New Deal measure was passed after 1938; that the growth of monopoly was tremendously increased under Roosevelt; that it was he who initiated the witchhunt with the signing of the Smith Act in 1940 and the federal prosecution of the 18 Trotskyists in 1941; that the first "subversive" list was drawn up under his administration; that he started the policy of government strikebreaking by plant and mine seizures. Don't they recall when William Z. Foster, in the June 17, 1941, Daily Worker, denounced Roosevelt's use of troops against the North American aircraft corporation strike as a "taste of the Hitleristic terrorism" Roosevelt had in store for labor in the coming war?

If Roosevelt's mantle is thread-bare and torn, it's still the best cover the Stalinists can find for their nakedness. They try their best to keep it patched up.

Miami Beach

By Ben Stone

On the lawn-deck overlooking Biscayne Bay one can watch the flamingos lazily circling overhead. They move gracefully and suddenly swoop down and alight close by. Then even more suddenly than they come, the flamingos flap their wings and fly off down the bay. It was twilight and in the velvety warmth of the setting sun, I dozed.

I roused myself with a start and hurried to catch the bus going from Surfside to Ocean Drive. The bus was just coming up. I boarded it and walked to the rear. Then I saw that all the back seats were already occupied by Negroes. I had heard of this practice but now I found myself in the middle of it. I became aware of the large obscene sign in front of the bus reading — **COLOR-ED SEATS IN REAR.** This was my first contact with Jim Crow in Miami. It soon became a familiar experience.

Jim Crow. This town of luxurious hotels and palatial estates, of easy spending and lush living, is strictly Jim Crow. Negroes are not permitted to reside in Miami Beach but must cross over into Miami City where they are segregated in the Negro ghetto. The exceptions are domestic servants in wealthy homes. They are allowed to "live in" after they have been fingerprinted and registered.

Miami Beach is part of the South where the word white is always spelled with a capital W, and where **FOR WHITES ONLY** is the supreme law. It goes without saying that Negroes cannot pa-

trionize hotels, restaurants or movies, and are forbidden the use of the public beaches. There is no mistaking it — Miami Beach is indeed a White Man's reservation!

But there is another side to Miami, the side of the working class. The labor movement is beginning to assert itself. The trade unions, particularly the CIO, are actively intervening in politics. Recently at a public hearing the union spokesmen made a laughing stock of the administration on the issue of slum clearance in Miami City. The Negro people likewise are becoming aroused and more articulate. This is indicated in two ways. First, by the heaviest Negro registration at the polls in the history of Florida and second, by the increasing demand for equality within the trade union movement itself.

One of the most hopeful signs for the future is the great solidarity displayed in all the strike struggles. The workers of this Southern city, Negro and white, are on the road to class consciousness.

There is no doubt that Miami Beach is beautiful. It combines the elements of the seashore, the countryside, and the big city. For most of the year the climate is superb. It is an ideal vacationland. No wonder that places like Miami Beach and Palm Beach are grabbed up by the rich and well-to-do. When the workers take over the industries and the land such places will be enjoyed by all of society.

Chicago Housing Scandal

By Gordon Bailey

When the federal government last year allocated 12,000 housing units to Chicago, Mayor Kennelly and the entire City Council hailed the news — for the record.

They were all for more houses for this slum-ridden city. But when the Chicago Housing Authority got down to select seven public housing sites in the city, these same enthusiasts began to sabotage. Each declared that while he favored public housing the particular site (located in his ward) had already been earmarked for private development and therefore must be vetoed.

Five of the seven sites were turned down; the two that were approved are located in the most dilapidated Jim Crow districts. A nine-member sub-committee then toured the city, in a chartered bus, looking for "suitable" sites. The junket turned out to be a punitive expedition against the handful of Aldermen who had voted for the original, CHA package.

The committee reluctantly concluded that they could not "dump" a site in Alderman Merriam's ward, which is entirely built up except for a section of the Chicago University campus. But in the ward of Alderman Becker, another public housing supporter, they found two sites. And they really went to town in Alderman Weber's ward where they discovered five sites. Ironically enough, Weber is a staunch opponent of public housing, who voted for the CHA package in order all the better to kill the entire measure later on.

Behind this Councilmanic sabotage of public housing are the big real estate sharks and apartment owners. They are opposed not only to pub-

lic housing but to any private construction not controlled by them. The big operators seek to perpetuate the housing shortage — and their profits.

In their propaganda they try to frighten the small homeowners with the bogey of falling property values because of influx of Negroes and low income families into the neighborhoods. In this way they ban race prejudice and make it appear that it is this that is responsible for opposition to public housing.

By approving only the two sites in predominantly Jim Crow districts, the Council has, in effect, continued and strengthened the pattern of Negro ghettos, despite Federal Housing provisions against it. Alderman Carey, representing the heart of the Negro section, stressed this in his minority report filed with the Council.

Public housing is in real danger in Chicago. The antics of the Council feed the vicious propaganda of the real estate interests and divert public attention away from the big property interests. The CHA can veto the Council's selections of sites and vice versa. The opponents of housing are conniving to produce such a deadlock. Then behind-the-scenes deal can be made for a couple of Jim Crow projects, leaving everything substantially as before.

Mass pressure and action by workers and tenants is needed to force the City government to put through any kind of adequate housing. By electing their own representatives to the City Council, the workers can prevent a repetition of the sabotage of public housing and connivance with the real estate sharks that Chicago is now witnessing.

Another 'New Look'?

By Jack Lerman

Ladies! How would you like a new wardrobe? This question arises because of Leon Stein's column on the shrinking clothing market in the March 15 issue of the ILGWU paper, Justice.

To make clear the pattern of thinking among the retailers and manufacturers faced with a dwindling market, Stein quotes H. Stanley Marcus, chairman of the American Retail Federation, who urges the retailers "to take a chance" on fashion.

He also quotes Louis Rubin, head of the Popular Priced Dress Manufacturers Association, who complains about the squeeze play of retailers who are "forcing the manufacturers to take all the risks."

And he quotes Q. Forrest Walker, economist for R. H. Macy, who advises improved sales planning, salesmanship and display, and "better pricing."

Now let us see what the Dubinskyite Leon Stein has to offer. He says the garment worker is worried about the rise (?) and fall of the volume of work. And then out comes his solution:

"Most discouraging is the fact that the industry, faced with such indecision, has been unable to hit upon any new style factor such as has in

the past carried the lethargic customer back into the stores." (My emphasis.)

What is he saying? In effect, this: "Mr. Boss, why don't you get your Paris designers to make another 'new look'? Force every woman who wants to be in style to buy a new wardrobe, just as the 'new look' carried the lethargic customers back into the stores last time."

Are the manufacturers, retailers and their representatives so stupid that they can't realize the advantage of such a move without Stein's prodding? No, they aren't stupid, but they understand the meaning of a shrinking market. They know they can't pull a "new look" with the lowered buying power of the consumer today.

Faced with a shrinking market, the manufacturers are waging a ruthless battle to cut down the working conditions and wages of the needle trades workers in order to keep up their high rate of profit.

About that Leon Stein says nothing. Like the leaders of the ILGWU, he thinks and acts in terms of "partnership" with the manufacturers and retailers. But the unemployed garment worker cannot feed himself on that kind of advice. And the women who are the first victims of "new style factors" aren't going to thank him for his suggestion either.

VOLUME XIV

MONDAY, APRIL 17, 1950

NUMBER 16

STUDENTS HIT DECREE BARRING PROFESSOR AT WAYNE UNIVERSITY

By Seymour Lyons

DETROIT, April 10 — Thought control "unprecedented in the history of an American university" has aroused a storm of opposition here. Leaders of the Detroit UAW, the national ACLU and many Wayne University campus organizations have protested the action of Wayne authorities barring Dr. Herbert Phillips from speaking on Wayne's campus. Phillips was fired from the University of Washington last year as a "communist."

With Wayne setting the precedent, the suppression of free speech has now spread to other Michigan colleges. Michigan University has followed in the tracks of Wayne's president, while Michigan State College is preparing to do the same.

UNITED PROTEST

But at Wayne more than 1,000 students have signed petitions demanding that President Henry permit Dr. Phillips a hearing. The signers embrace all shades of political opinion — Democrats, Republicans, Stalinists, Socialists and Trotskyists. There are few Stalinists on the campus, and the protests have been sponsored and led by anti-Stalinists.

Leading the opposition to the gag decree is the Student Council, elected by the student body. The editors of the Detroit Collegian, official campus paper, state that "one of the inherent rights of a democratic society is

the right to free discussion." And yet, they add, this right is being suppressed as the "tide of red hysteria rolls on. . . and Wayne University has been engulfed in its waves."

The witch-hunt at Wayne comes on the heels of a fascist-like raid on the Detroit Labor Youth League, a Stalinist organization. Two weeks ago, newspaper articles and pictures were used in a tabloid attack on this organization. Two days later, hoodlums ransacked its office, smeared red paint around and tore up literature.

Within 48 hours the FBI was investigating — not the hoodlums, but the Labor Youth League "primarily" and "student activities" in general. No mention whatever was made of finding the gangsters responsible for the vandalism. Thus the FBI is aping Hitler's Gestapo by attacking the victims while covering up their persecutors.

Many students at Wayne point out that a victory against the gag decree would inspire civil rights defenders in other schools, while a defeat would make the witch-hunters and their allies bolder.

ADAMIC'S MAGAZINE GIVES MORE REPORTS ON YUGOSLAVIA

The Mid-Spring number of Louis Adamic's magazine, Trends and Tides, is now available. It contains a number of letters written by Adamic

to friends in the U. S. during his prolonged stay in Yugoslavia last year, an excerpt from his diary written in Belgrade and notes he made of impressions of Italy. The letters — "Tito — a Looming Figure" and "A Poet in His Grave. . . And the Trouble with Giants" — give Adamic's impressions of the leaders of the Yugoslav CP and of the thinking of Slovenian intellectuals.

The diary note from Belgrade contains an interesting account of a conversation Adamic had in January 1949 with Vladimir Popovitch, one of the top Yugoslav leaders and ambassador to Moscow at the time of the Cominform denunciation of the Tito regime. Popovitch gives the following account of his interview with Molotov at the time:

"Comrade Molotov," I asked, "as Yugoslav ambassador and personally, have I not always been a good friend of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics?"

"Molotov nodded.

"Comrade Molotov," has not New Yugoslavia, under Tito, always been a good friend, and devoted ally of the U.S.S.R.?"

"Molotov hesitated, then nodded again.

"Comrade Molotov, have you not during the last five years, always felt and known that, come

what may, Tito's Yugoslavia would be on the side of the Soviet Union?"

"Molotov hesitated again, longer than before. Finally he nodded for the third time.

"Then, Comrade Molotov," I said, "what is the reason . . . what is the explanation of this outburst against us? Why could we not have solved our differences as comrades?"

"Molotov did not answer and he did not look at me, so I repeated the question; and then he said, 'You would not understand.'"

"Why wouldn't I understand?"

"You would not understand," Molotov said again.

"Do you consider me a good Communist, Comrade Molotov?" I asked.

"He inclined his head slightly, which I interpreted as a nod, and I said, 'Then, Comrade Molotov, if I am a good Communist, I should be able to understand.'"

"Throughout this interview Molotov's face was without expression. He rose, there was nothing for me to do but go."

T&T sells for 35 cents per copy. Rates for subscriptions, which can be obtained by writing to Louis Adamic, Milford, N. J., are \$2 for six or more issues in 1950.

SOUND UNITY DEPENDS ON RANKS

(Continued from Page 1)

AFL. They have been encouraged into the hope that the CIO — weakened by purges and bureaucratic expulsions, with its ranks stifled and its militancy muzzled — will be more amenable to the kind of unity the AFL chiefs have always wanted. Are Murray and his lieutenants ready to make a deal that will consolidate the CIO and AFL bureaucracies in a front of common defense against the militant ranks in return for organizational concessions to the AFL craft internationalists? Who can say what will happen in unity negotiations behind locked doors with the rank and file excluded? As for Murray's own motives

and aims, these are not hard to fathom. What concerns him most in his alliance with the Truman Democrats and the foreign policy of Truman's State Department. His open letter to the union leaders on unity is explicit, so far as program is concerned, only on the need to defeat the "unholy coalition of Dixiecrats and reactionary Republicans" in the coming Congressional elections. By that means to mobilize a united labor front to continue his bankrupt policy of supporting candidates of the capitalist parties, particularly the Truman Democrats.

Murray does not want unity to strengthen labor as an independent force against the capitalists, their government and political agents. He wants to channelize the powerful sentiment for labor unity into the swamp of class-collaborationist politics, of support for the Truman machine and the cold war.

What motivates the unity sentiments of the union ranks is entirely different. They are sick and disgusted with the division in labor's ranks that saw the steel workers, then the coal miners, and now the Chrysler workers forced into isolated bitter battles against the entrenched corporate interests while the rest of labor scarcely lifted a finger to help. They want unity in order to give battle.

For this kind of unity it is necessary that the ranks take the



DR. HERBERT PHILLIPS

Truman Offers Drop in Bucket To Jobless Army

(Continued from Page 1)

unemployment compensation that provides every unemployed worker with a decent standard of living for the entire period of unemployment. This means unemployment payments equal to trade union wages, with no limit on the duration of payments, federally administered and distributed on a uniform basis nationally.

WHAT IS NEEDED

But the workers cannot stop at this. America's industrial system can provide jobs for all. The workers must demand and fight for socially useful work that will enable them to support themselves and their dependents in decency, comfort and health.

The enormous increase in labor productivity has gone only to swell already record-high profits. The corporations can easily afford to reduce the work week and maintain weekly take-home pay so as to keep more workers employed. This immediate measure to maintain employment is embodied in the slogan which most of the unions adopted — but never pushed — more than a decade ago: **FOR THE 30-HOUR WEEK AT 40 HOURS PAY!**

If mass unemployment of increasingly long duration exists today when business conditions, as Secretary of Commerce Sawyer points out, are "excellent," what will be the situation of the American workers when a real depression hits? Tens of millions will face pauperization and starvation.

Truman is not preparing for such conditions. At most, he pays lip service to the needs of the unemployed, while he diverts the billions that are needed for social welfare into the war machine. Only organized, militant nationwide action by the labor movement will force the capitalist government to take effective measures to meet the needs of the unemployed and to maintain more jobs.

Angry Hosiery Union Members Fight Wage Cut

PHILADELPHIA, April 9 — In protest against a 35% cut in rates, 1,200 workers at Gotham Hosiery Mills, one of the largest here, refused to go in to work last week.

They returned to work the following day, only after being threatened with loss of seniority by officials of both the company, and the independent American Federation of Full Fashioned Hosiery Workers Union.

A week before this, union members from a Riverside, N. J., mill threw a picket line around the international union office in Philadelphia, also in protest against the wage cut. Throughout the organized hosiery industry, which is strongest in the Philadelphia area, resentment is brewing and other demonstrations will probably occur soon.

TRIBUNAL'S DECISION

A large part of the workers' anger is directed at the officials of the union for their lack of action to halt the wage cuts. According to the recently negotiated agreement between the Hosiery Manufacturers Assn. and the union, a tri-partite "tribunal" was set up with power to review the wage scales and make binding decisions. The board consists of a union official, a manufacturer official, and a third person designated by the other two.

Recently the manufacturers complained that as long as they pay the union wage scale they cannot compete with the unorganized mills, which are mostly in the South. By a two to one decision, the tribunal concurred in the employers' claim by ordering the wage cut, and the union leaders accepted the decision.

Though the hosiery workers of Philadelphia have a militant tradition, the union officials have not authorized a strike in nearly 15 years, and have followed the path of "labor statesmen" in relations with the employers. Their alibi for depending on the good-will of the employers is the real danger presented by the large-scale migration of the industry into unorganized areas, which started before the war and has been resumed recently.

Until last year, the American Federation of Hosiery Workers was an autonomous section of the CIO Textile Workers Union. It

withdrew on the ground that the CIO international had failed to aid in the organization of the run-away hosiery mills in the South.

LEADER'S ALIBIS

Whenever criticized by the rank and file for accepting the employers' proposals, the union officials answer by declaring that they must or the mills would move away. When the Riverside millworkers demonstrated outside the international office, President Alex McKeown told them that instead they should be picketing non-union shops. While constantly recognizing the need of an organization drive, the union leaders shrink back from the task, pleading the poverty of the union, though it has considerable investments in bonds and real estate and pays the bureaucrats some of the highest salaries in the labor movement.

POLITICAL TIES

This lack of a militant leadership can only lead to a further weakening of the union, as the rank and file correctly recognize. The only way in which the industry can be organized is by a militant program in the presently unorganized shops and a full scale organizing drive in the South tied in with a program for an independent labor party.

At present, the Hosiery Workers union officials are allied with the Truman Democrats who bolster up the anti-labor and anti-Negro regimes of the Southern states. William Leader, manager of Philadelphia Branch 1, the largest local in the union, is an ally of the local Republican Party machine!

As part of the deal to shove the wage cut down the throats of the workers, union officials, management and the Philadelphia newspapers have combined to suppress the story of the Gotham workers' action, for fear that it might set off similar "wildcat" strikes and lead to the development of a rank-and-file opposition group in the union.

REUTHERITES LOSE KEY POSTS IN BELL AIRCRAFT ELECTION

(Cont. from page 1)

was its candidate for Councilman in the last city election.

Regarded as a progressive and by some even as a militant, Schuetz's meager vote was attributed by his Rank and File opponents to the wishy-washy position he took on the strike policy and settlement and the fact that he and his group showed more eagerness in arriving at a common slate with the Reutherites to beat the Rank and File than in posing the vital issues squarely.

RANK AND FILE POSITION

In contrast, the Rank and File group took a clear-cut position on the strike and made that their major campaign issue. "The strike was really won on the picket line but it was your leaders who handed over to the company the fruits of your victory during negotiations." This was the main point in the Rank and File's election campaign. They demanded a return of the Rank and File leadership because they claimed "a continuation of the present leadership will mean a continuation of the same policies which led to such a disastrous defeat."

The Reuther group on the other hand claimed that the "strike settlement was the best that could have been obtained under the circumstances" and that the Rank and File group could not have done any better had they been in the leadership. They branded the Rank and File criticisms as "reckless and ridiculous."

As the campaign developed, it became obvious that the Rank and File group was gaining more and more support on the basis of its sharp criticism of the Reuther leadership's policy on the strike settlement which the vast majority of the members now feel was a terrible blow to their union from which they are only now slowly recovering.

In order to bolster support for their declining fortunes in the local union, the Reuther group again began to red-bait the Rank and File group as they had successfully done a year ago. However, this time the membership

did not fall for it. The bitter experience of the 18-week strike in which the company red-baited everybody, including the Reutherites, evidently did not cut as much ice this time. The members now seem more inclined to judge the various slates on the basis of program and past performance.

NOT A MAJORITY

The Rank and File did not, however, win a full majority of the officers and top-bargaining committee members. They did carry the presidency, financial secretary and the top-bargaining chairmanship, which are the most important offices in the local. They also won the posts for guide, sergeant-at-arms and one top-bargaining committeeman.

The reason why the Rank and File did not win a full majority was that in the original election the Schuetz group and the Reutherites supported several of the same candidates but on different slates. They consequently received the majority and were not subject to a run-off election.

If the Rank and File leadership continues the militant policies and progressive program on the basis of which they were elected, it is certain that they will have the support of the membership even though they have not obtained a full majority on the executive board and on the top-committee.

Baldanzi Faces Axe in Textile Feud With Rieve

Emil Rieve, president of the CIO Textile Workers Union, has announced he will oppose the reelection of Executive Vice President George Baldanzi at the union's convention in Boston starting May 1. The basis for the purge appears to be personal rivalry. It is said that Rieve is disturbed by the prominence and prestige of Baldanzi.

Baldanzi headed the ill-fated CIO organizational drive in the South and took an outstanding part in the purge of the Stalinist-led unions at the last CIO convention. Now he is learning that the method of bureaucratic purges is a two-edged axe.