Workers of the World, Unite!

THE MILITANT

PUBLISHED WEEKLY IN THE INTERESTS OF THE WORKING PEOPLE

Vol. XVII - No. 20 | 267 | NEW YORK, N. Y., MONDAY, MAY 18, 1953 | PRICE: 10 CENTS

McCARTHY SMEARS THE "POST"

(See Page 3)

Churchill "Peace" Maneuver Designed to Hide War Plans

2-Year-Old Witch-Hunt Victim

Shamin Johnathan Ahmed, 2, faces deportation under the McCarran-Walter act. Held by his mother, Mrs. Ericka Fogg Ahmed, and flanked by his brother Munir in their Connecticut home, Shamin comes under the heading of a "security risk." His father, Shami Ahmed, is in Pakistan on a geological expedition awaiting a permit to enter U.S. His mother is American.

Ohio Solons Move to Raid Jobless Fund

AKRON, May 5 — The Ohio Legislature is giving a dramatic illustration of its reactionary character by its treatment of two bills now before it. One — Senate Bill 173 — is an outright steal from the unemployment compensation fund, the other — House Bill 308 — is a police-state law.

Over the violent protests of labor, the state Senators are about to railroad through a 47% cut in the assessments on employers for unemployment compensation. This would reduce the money paid into the fund by Ohio employers by $35 million a year. The excuse given for this action, so pleasing to the greedy Ohio industrialists, is that the fund at present has a surplus.

DEMAND INCREASE

Union spokesmen pointed out that the surplus wouldn't be there to worry the legislators if decent unemployment benefits were paid out. They demanded that the benefits be raised from the present inadequate $28 a week to $44 a week and that the $2.50 a week allowance for dependent children be increased to $4. Since the allowance for dependent children is at present limited to a maximum of two children, labor demanded that the allowance be for as many children as the unemployed worker actually has.

But this fell on deaf ears and the state Senate is sure to pass Bill 173 by an overwhelming majority.

DEVINE BILL

While the Ohio Senate was busily whittling away the workers' economic rights, the Ohio House was equally busy wielding a hatchet on workers' political rights. The House Judiciary Committee which is pushing the Devine Bill (Bill 308), a measure which would nullify most constitutional liberties in Ohio, delivered a calculated insult to the CIO.

Whereas spokesmen favoring the Devine Bill were not interfered with, the spokesman for the Ohio CIO Council, J. R. Rooney, was prevented from reading a prepared statement opposing the police-state bill. Similar contemptuous treatment was given Charles Miller of the Cleveland Civil Liberties Union, which is vigorously fighting the Devine Bill.

The Tidelands Oil Steal

By Paul Abbott

The gigantic tidelands oil steal, involving public resources amounting to perhaps trillions of dollars, is stirring nation-wide indignation.

While Democrats and Republicans are shot-gunning legislation through Congress to turn over the fabulously rich pools of black gold to the oil trust under legal cover of handing title of federal property in the off-shore lands to the states, letters of protest are pouring onto the desks of the political representatives of Big Business.

Senator Magnuson (D. Wash.), who opposes the steal, said May 5 that his mail on the question has been unusual not only in volume but in unanimity of opinion. "Of all the telegrams and letters I have received, less than 3% favor the Congress turning our offshore oil resources over to the states; 97% plus want the Federal Government to retain jurisdiction and control."

Another unusual feature of his mail, said the Senator, is that about 51% is "from women who seem particularly concerned about the inadequacy of our schools."

A couple in Auburn, Wash., wrote the Senator: "We have a dire need which is constantly growing for more support for our school system. Our teachers are underpaid and our school rooms are overcrowded. It is not right that 'big business' should get their 'hooks' into these oil rights that could be considered part of the United States as a whole and part of every citizen's inherent property now and for posterity."

Such views were summed up by the woman president of the Bellingham, Wash., Federation of Teachers: **"I would like to see those billions of dollars rolling for education instead of being preempted by a few greedy states. The schools need those billions."**

A woman from Seattle saw the oil steal as only the beginning: "Giving title to these resources to the states would set an unfortunate precedent: Republicans might then try to give federal power projects that taxpayers have financed, federal park lands, to the states, and atomic energy rights to private business." Many other letter writers thought the same.

Senator Magnuson also reported that labor organizations are indignant and that he has received messages from the Central Labor Councils of many cities bitterly opposing the trillion-dollar gift to the oil trust.

He quoted an editorial by Henry P. Carstensen, one of the heads of the Washington State Grange, which has 40,000 members, declaring that the "super oil steal . . . makes Teapot Dome look like peanuts. . ."

Carstensen's editorial ended with the following indication of the ire of the Grange: ". . . notice should be served on the Congressional majority that if this legislation becomes law, the people will one day repudiate them; and that in all likelihood the oil interests will have won but a Pyrrhic victory, **because it may inevitably result in expropriation of their holdings due to a public opinion exasperated beyond all patience.**"

Many angered Americans will undoubtedly subscribe to this view. It may even occur to some that the date of expropriation should be moved up. Why not nationalize the entire oil industry right now? That would not only halt Operation Plunder but would serve as a salutary political lesson to the whole gang of robber barons now casing what remains of our public resources.

Instigator of Cold War Seeks "Mediator" Role Between U.S., Moscow

By Joseph Hansen

Sir Winston Churchill's May 11 speech calling for a conference behind closed doors "on the highest level" between "the leading powers" has been widely hailed as a significant move toward peace. It drew warm applause both in Europe and America from the liberals and from the masses longing for an end to the war threat. And by way of reflex, as if to confirm its pacific intent, it was met with bitter denunciation from the rabid right-wing Republicans and the war-mongering China lobby.

Has the octogenarian Prime Minister of the British Empire suddenly become a peace-lover and a peace-maker in his old age? Before we reach such a hasty conclusion from a single speech, let us recall that this is the same Churchill who organized the world-wide coalition of imperialist powers that sought to drown the young Soviet Union in blood in the days of Lenin and Trotsky, the same Churchill whose name is synonomous with "blood, sweat and tears," the same Anglo-American statesman who launched the cold war on the Soviet Union with his saber-rattling speech at Fulton, Missouri, March 5, 1946. It is absolutely fatuous to think that this Tory war dog is suddenly performing new tricks in complete contradiction to his entire character and background.

How, then, are we to explain his talk about the possibility of a "generation of peace" if he can get Malenkov and Eisenhower together in secret around the negotiating table?

FOSTER'S VIEW

Let us first consider the explanation offered by Malenkov's American representative, William Z. Foster, one of the heads of the Communist Party. This Stalinist chief puts it as "The taming of Winston Churchill." What tamed Churchill, according to Foster, is "the deepening crisis of the British economy," "the accelerated break-up of the British empire," and "the rising anti-war spirit among the British people." The "historic event of major importance," however, was detonation of the first Soviet atom bomb in September 1949. That event, in Foster's view, changed Churchill's mind about war. "It was one thing to be the Number One war-maker when making war seemed to be only a matter of deluging defenseless Russian cities with devastating atom bombs; but it was something quite different when there was the sure prospect, in the event of an atomic war, that Britain herself would be promptly blasted off the map."

This sounds quite plausible until we consider the conclusion that must be drawn from Foster's explanation — Churchill must strive for peace despite himself, despite the needs of British imperialism which requires destruction of the Soviet planned economy and the crushing of colonial revolts, and despite the needs of Wall Street which has a stranglehold on Britain and sees

(Continued on Page 2)

Lattimore Decision Hits Gov't Witch Hunters

By George Lavan

The importance of Federal Judge Luther W. Youngdahl's decision in the pre-trial hearings of the perjury indictments against Owen Lattimore were pointed out in an editorial in last week's **Militant**.

That editorial dealt with Youngdahl's courageous upholding of the First and Sixth Amendments to the Constitution by throwing out four of the government's perjury counts. He said that the principal charge was so "nebulous and indefinite that a jury would have to indulge in speculation in order to arrive at a verdict" and that the very charge restricted freedom of thought and expression.

Judge Youngdahl's decision made other equally important points that the **Militant** editorial of last week, for reasons of space, was unable to take up. These dealt with the three perjury charges against Lattimore that Youngdahl did not throw out and upon which Lattimore will be brought to trial October 6.

The McCarran Committee and now the federal prosecutor alleges that Lattimore committed perjury in his testimony before the Senate Internal Security subcommittee as follows. (1) Lattimore stated that he had not been told before 1950 that a certain Chinese was a Communist; the prosecutor says he knew before then. (2) Lattimore said that he had lunch with the Soviet ambassador to the U.S. during the Stalin-Hitler pact period; the prosecutor says the lunch took place after the Stalin-Hitler pact period. (3) Lattimore said that he had not handled the correspondence of Lauchlin Currie, an aide to Roosevelt, during Currie's absence for a short period; the prosecutor says he did.

Lattimore's testimony before the McCarran witch-hunt committee concerned tiny details of events that had taken place from 10 to 18 years before. For 12 days Lattimore was subjected to a merciless questioning designed to smear and trip him up on details. **The three charges of perjury listed above are all the government witch hunters have been able to emerge with. But even these are not good enough, says Judge Youngdahl.**

While refusing to throw out these three charges, Youngdahl said: "there is serious doubt whether the remaining counts . . . can ultimately pass the test of materiality so as to present a jury issue." He then ordered the government to file a bill of particulars substantiating the three charges of perjury. He ordered that they name overt acts, witnesses, dates and places.

This is a terrific blow to the government. Up till now its prosecutors have depended not on proof of overt acts to convince juries but upon smears and the "red spy" hysteria promoted by the newspapers. It also marks an attempt by Youngdahl to return political trials to the rules of evidence and the Bill of Rights. If this were done all political trials would end with acquittals.

(Continued on page 4)

Facts Refute Fake Tale Of "Income Revolution"

By Harry Frankel

The capitalist system, Marxists have always maintained, operates in such a way that the total wealth of a capitalist nation is ever-increasingly concentrated in fewer and fewer hands, while a growing mass of the population owns, as time passes, a smaller and smaller share of the national wealth. Side by side with this trend there is another that derives from it: The income produced every year is shared very unevenly between capitalist and wage-worker, and, as the years go by, this unevenness of sharing becomes more and more pronounced.

It has become very hard for supporters of U.S. capitalism to offer any proof that would overthrow the first law. Even school children today know the extent to which ownership of American industry is concentrated in a few hands, and know as well that the greatest mass of Americans are stripped of every remnant of ownership or control in the industries of the nation. Most Americans also know from their histories that this was not always the case; that 150 years ago the wealth of the nation was far more evenly distributed.

But, in spite of the fact that the capitalist propagandists can't challenge the first law, they make repeated attempts to challenge the corollary of that law. They try to prove that in spite of the fact that ownership of industry has become less democratic (to use an understatement), that the income derived from this industry is being more and more democratically distributed.

Dr. Simon Kuznets of the National Bureau of Economic Research has now thrown the weight of his great academic reputation in the field of income statistics into this argument. In a new book called **Shares of Upper Income Groups in Income and Savings**, he "discovers" that the share of the national income received by the top income groups in the nation has declined "strikingly and persistently" since 1939.

The following figures summarize his "findings": The top 1% of the population got 12% of the national income in 1939, and in 1948 got only 8½%. The top 7% of the people got 27.8% of the dollars in 1939, and were down to 20.7% in 1948. This would mean that the other 93% of the people got an increase from 72.2% to 79.3% of the income.

Aside from the fact that the top 1% of the people would still be getting 8½ times as much as they should even if these figures were right, the figures themselves are based on certain obvious fallacies. They do not at all prove a "social revolution," as various eager-beaver columnists hastily boasted.

Sylvia F. Porter, the widely syndicated columnist, concluded her article of May 4 on this subject by saying: "But above all is the shining point that the revolution of which Karl Marx dreamed has come true. Not in Russia, though. Here."

We Marxists, who are even more eager than Miss Porter to see Karl Marx's "dream come true," must point out that Marx can be vindicated only by a comparison of the status of social classes. In the field of income this would mean comparing the trend in the income of the working class with that of the capitalist class.

Mr. Kuznets has not compared classes, but only percentages which do not correspond to classes. When he refers to the income of the "bottom 93%" of the population, he is not referring to the income of the working class, but

(Continued on page 2)

Attorney General Defies U.S. Supreme Court

By George Breitman

What would happen if a trade union or a radical organization would refuse to abide by a decision of the U.S. Supreme Court?

It doesn't take much imagination to supply the answer: The newspapers would whip up a lynch spirit. The politicians would howl for blood. The courts would grind out heavy fines and prison sentences for "contempt."

And yet, for two full years, an important decision of the U.S. Supreme Court has been cynically and deliberately defied by three Attorneys General — two Democrats, J. Howard McGrath and James P. McGranery, and the present Republican incumbent, Herbert Brownell, Jr.

The Attorney General is not supposed to be above the law; in fact, he is supposed to be the top law-enforcement officer of the federal government. But when he thumbs his nose at the Supreme Court, no capitalist newspaper rebukes him for it, no capitalist politician becomes indignant, no judge calls him to order.

"Equal justice," we are told, is the hallmark of the American way of life. But a lot seems to depend on who you are and what you do. A striking worker will get thrown into jail if he ignores a court injunction and insists on exercising his democratic right to picket in defense of his job and decent working conditions. But an Attorney General can in effect violate the Constitution and tell the Supreme Court to go to hell and nobody will bother him — if his contemptuous behavior serves the interests of the capitalist class. Here is the proof:

THE COURT RULES

Two years ago, on April 30, 1951, the U.S. Supreme Court finally handed down a decision on the so-called "subversive" list issued by the Attorney General to punish and proscribe hundreds of organizations he did not approve of. (This became known as the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee decision.)

By a clear vote of five to three, the Supreme Court ruled that the Attorney General had acted in a "patently arbitrary" manner, flagrantly exceeding his authority when he applied his "subversive" designation to three blacklisted organizations who had appealed to the courts.

The majority decision, written by Justice Burton and supported by Justices Jackson, Frankfurter, Black and Douglas, sharply rebuked the Attorney General for his designation of the groups on his blacklist and added:

"The situation is comparable to one which would be created if the Attorney General, under like circumstances, were to designate the American National Red Cross as a Communist organization."

This majority decision gave the following explanation of what was arbitrary about the Attorney General's procedure:

"The designation of these organizations was not preceded by any administrative hearing. The organizations received no notice that they were to be listed, had no opportunity to present evidence on their own behalf and were not informed of the evidence on which the designations rest."

If words have any meaning, the Attorney General was told by the Supreme Court he had no right to blacklist organizations without a hearing, advance notice, knowledge of exactly what they were accused of and the opportunity to answer the charges.

JUST AS BEFORE

That was two years ago. Attorney General McGrath made like he didn't hear.

Just as if the Supreme Court did not exist, McGrath went right on using his blacklist the same as before, even adding new groups to it. Just as if the Supreme Court had endorsed and blessed his repressive blacklist, McGrath kept on using it to victimize groups and individuals whom he, McCarthy and McCarran don't like.

And when McGrath was booted out of his job in a cloud of corruption, the Democratic hack who took his place, McGranery, did the same until the last day of the Truman administration.

Nobody in either capitalist party uttered one sylllable of complaint. And nobody on the Supreme Court mumbled a word of even polite protest.

IN COMES THE GOP

In came the new Republican regime, and a new Attorney General. Last month, Eisenhower revoked Truman's unconstitutional "loyalty" order which the Attorney General had used as his pretext for the blacklist. But in his new and equally unconstitutional "security" order, Eisenhower directed his Attorney General Brownell to keep on issuing a "subversive" list.

Two days later, on April 29, Brownell acted accordingly. He announced the names of 62 new groups that he had added to the list — many of them organizations whose only "crime" was that they had defended some of the victims of the witch hunt, raised money for their legal expenses, appeals, families, etc.

In addition, Brownell said he had re-designated as "subversive" 192 organizations previously on the Democratic Attorney Generals' lists.

Brownell also announced a new procedure: Under it, according to the April 30 **N. Y. Herald Tribune**, "groups notified they are to be listed as subversive have ten days to file a protest with the Justice Department. The department will then state the grounds for such listing and the group will have an opportunity to reply. If the organization requests a hearing, the Attorney General has the authority to assign a Justice Department officer or board to conduct it. . . The final decision as to whether the group is to be listed as subversive will rest with the Attorney General."

Both the new and old groups listed as "subversive," he said, could follow this procedure.

Brownell claimed that this procedure was worked out to "conform" with the Supreme Court's 1951 ruling.

That is an outright lie. The Supreme Court did not merely say that the groups on the list were entitled to a hearing. It said they must have a fair hearing BEFORE being blacklisted.

WHAT THE COURT SAID

Justice Burton said the Attorney General's procedure was arbitrary because "The designation of these organizations was not **PRECEDED** by any administrative hearing."

Justice Frankfurter made the same point in his concurring statement when he declared that "the right to be heard **BEFORE** being condemned to suffer grievous loss of any kind, even though it may not involve the stigma and hardships of a criminal conviction, is a principle basic to our society."

Justice Jackson said in his concurring opinion: "To promulgate with force of law a conclusive finding of disloyalty, without hearing at some stage **BEFORE** such finding becomes final, is a denial of due process of law."

(Continued on page 2)

Churchill Seeks "Mediator" Role In War Crisis

(Continued from page 1)

eye to eye with the British capitalists about the Soviet Union and colonial revolutions.

As if recognizing this, Foster cancels his previous argument by admitting that Churchill "would much like to see a far more favorable conjuncture for his anti-Soviet war than exists in the present uncompromising prospects." We are thus left about where we started. **The question to determine is not what Churchill "would much like to see," but what he actually hopes to accomplish by his calculated move.**

BOLSTERS THE TORIES

The immediate political advantages are obvious. By expressing the yearnings of the war-weary British people for peace, Churchill wins their sympathy. By proposing to do something practical about getting peace, he converts the sympathy into political support. British publicity channels stressed Churchill's "independence" from Washington in making his move, thereby appealing to the deep-going resentment against Wall Street's war plans current not only in Britain but throughout Europe and the world.

To appear as the peace-maker cuts the ground from under the Labor Party stand that Churchill is nothing but a war-monger. The praise from Laborite leaders for his demagogic remarks helps this considerably. And if war is being planned in the not-distant future, what better political position for an imperialist war-monger to be in than the recognized champion of peace? That makes it far easier to lead the people into war.

All this is gained by simply calling for a secret conference. Churchill spoke the truth when he said, "I do not see why anyone should be frightened of having a try."

QUESTION OF DIFFERENCES

But what about the bitter denunciations of Churchill by the Hearst-McCormick press, and the right-wing Republicans, especially the hydrophobic McCarthyites? Didn't Churchill reveal deep-going differences between British and American imperialism?

There are many differences between the two capitalist powers but the differences were not exactly the keynote of Churchill's speech. In fact, all his main proposals paralleled Eisenhower's position. Eisenhower has publicly affirmed his willingness to meet "half-way" with the successors of Stalin. Churchill simply made the date more definite. He also talked as Eisenhower did about the Kremlin coming through with some advance "deeds," such as a truce in Korea on Washington's terms, a treaty for Austria, and a "piece-meal" approach to other questions. He also carefully stressed the need to keep up the armament drive, to "maintain our defense up to the limit of our strength." Such concessions in his speech as letting Poland remain under Soviet control, and giving guarantees about coming to the aid of the USSR in case of another attack by Germany are really minor differences with what Eisenhower has said.

Exercised as Senator Knowland may be over the alleged rift, it does not seem to have disturbed the **Wall Street Journal.** "It seems to us that these differences need not be a cause for alarm; that there is little basis for the cry that inevitably will go up that Russia has succeeded in 'driving a wedge' between the Americans and the British." (April 13.)

"USEFUL SUPPLEMENT"

The Republican **N. Y. Herald-Tribune** declared editorially May 13 that there is no difference with Churchill "on fundamentals" and that "his speech will be welcomed by a large body of American opinion, finding it a useful supplement to the American position as defined by President Eisenhower."

The authoritative **N. Y. Times** said May 13 "there are no differences in their ultimate aim . . . no substantial differences even as regards the process for attaining it." It added that there are "even reasons to assume" that the meeting advocated by Churchill has been discussed and Churchill "spoke in the light of such a discussion."

Such evidence indicates that the line of Churchill's speech was approved in advance by Eisenhower — that it is part and parcel of a common approach to the Kremlin.

We can piece together a few items from various sources that will give us an idea of the stake Eisenhower has in Churchill's move:

N. Y. Herald Tribune, May 12, dispatch from Washington: "There was also a feeling, expressed privately, that the warm respect and admiration which the British Prime Minister enjoys in this country might make it easier for President Eisenhower to set aside some of his present public objections to early Big Three meeting."

Christian Science Monitor, May 13, dispatch from Washington: "The constitutional division of governmental powers between United States legislative and executive branches makes it easier for Sir Winston to take the ball now than for the President: the ball that Mr. Eisenhower actually started in motion with his important April 16 speech to the editors. Congressmen who would have denounced any such proposal from a Democrat, who would have objected almost as strongly to one from Mr. Eisenhower, can go along grudgingly when the initiative is Sir Winston's, reserving the right to object, and perhaps rejoicing at the opportunity to complain at the British along the route."

Frankfurter **Allgemeine,** reported in the May 12 **Monitor:** "Churchill belongs entirely to the West, but he feels called upon to act as intermediary between Washington and Moscow. . ."

United Press, May 11, dispatch from Moscow: "Some diplomats said Soviet leaders might be ready to confer with Sir Winston alone to lay the foundation for a subsequent enlarged meeting if the United States finds it difficult to meet in accordance with the Churchill plan."

SEEK CONCESSIONS

Churchill's role as mediator would be to obtain maximum concessions from the Kremlin in return for minimum concessions from Washington. Among Washington's concessions would be an easement, what the diplomats call a "detente," in the pressure on the Soviet bloc. The situation is analogous to a bitter strike struggle in which a federal mediator is brought in to ply his wiles on the leadership of the union.

In view of the fact that the Anglo-American bloc is headed toward another war at a tempo much faster than that following World War I and leading up to World War II, it may seem strange that the Eisenhower administration would consider temporarily easing the tension.

Perhaps Eisenhower hopes major concessions can be wrung from the Kremlin that would weaken the position of the Soviet bloc in the projected war. Churchill, for instance, spoke cryptically about not impeding "any spontaneous and healthy evolution which may be taking place inside Russia" and said he "regarded some of the internal manifestations and apparent change of mind as far more important than what has happened outside." He even discounted the recent advance of the Viet-Minh in Indo-China, saying it "ought not to lead us to conclude it was a Soviet-inspired move inconsistent with the new attitude of the Soviet Government."

HATRED OF AMERICA

Whether or not the Kremlin responds to the atom-bomb blackmail, the Eisenhower administration, it appears to me, may feel forced to resort to a more flexible diplomacy than that followed by the State Department under Acheson. **America's entry into the Korean civil war, which Wall Street needed to launch major preparations for world conflict, has aroused the peoples of the entire earth. To hundreds of millions, America is about as popular as Germany was under Hitler.**

This makes it exceedingly difficult to lead these people abroad into another war. In the U.S. itself great uneasiness exists about the war drive. The capitalist class is therefore faced with a crisis of leadership in achieving its push toward war. One of the means whereby they can try to solve this is by appearing to change course — to pretend to be seeking peace.

The effects of such a turn can be judged by the reaction of a political weathervane like I. F. Stone. Already he sees Eisenhower seeking a "disengagement" in Korea. "General Eisenhower is proving much less bellicose than Captain Truman. . . The Democrats now seem to be the war party. . . I, though never a card-carrying Republican, am beginning to like Eisenhower."

This is the way sheep line up behind a judas goat. It is a good indication of what is in store if Churchill - Eisenhower follow through.

Strike Pays Off

According to the CIO United Steelworkers the eight-week strike in 1952 cost the average striker a maximum of 364.48 in earnings. Increased wages and other benefits resulting from the strike, however, amount to 565.76 a year.

Why They Picketed N.Y. City Hall

By Lawrence Barnes

NEW YORK, May 9 — Civil service employee groups here recently showed their mounting dissatisfaction with working conditions by picketing City Hall by the thousands. The occasion was the public hearings on the 1953-54 budget at which leaders of both AFL and CIO key civil service locals and associations joined forces to denounce the Mayor's fiscal plans for the year as well as Governor Dewey's plans affecting New York City.

These protests revealed greater boldness and solidarity among civil service ranks than ever before. Over a half-dozen large civil service employee organizations opposed mass lay-offs. Threat of a possible strike was presented to the Board of Estimate by both the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL, and the Uniformed Firemen's Association, AFL.

One spokesman asserted that "it's the city employees who are taking a beating" and said that if the $1,528,812,795 budget was not revised, "Conlon-Wadlin or not, vital services in this city will not be functioning." The Conlon-Wadlin state law makes strikes by government employees illegal. Another spokesman exhorted the mayor to put up a fight to "force the problem of city finances on the state Legislature's agenda at a special session in May."

In general, demands were made for a $700 pay increase, a minimum salary of $3,000 per year, a 40-hour week and a reduction in employees' pension contributions.

Sub-standard wages, retrenchment in hiring and purchasing of materials make it increasingly onerous to work for the city. Civil service workers feel they have been subsidizing the city and see no redress forthcoming. Industrial workers have the strike and other weapons with which to combat the bosses; civil servants must tackle the government administrative apparatus.

As inflation and reaction mount, civil service ranks are forced to adopt more militant forms of protest, as indicated by their readiness to aid in a march on Albany along the lines suggested by City Council Pres. Halley.

The ranks rely on their organizations to win their demands, but now they are up a blind alley. On top of the wholesale graft and corruption in high places, there is City Hall's cry of lack of funds.

Funds are short because these capitalist politicians refuse to tax the enormous profits of the real estate moguls and the tremendous revenues of the insurance companies (especially fire). Nor have they dared tax the transactions of the stock exchange.

This has resulted in moods of distrust and possibly the conviction that the politicians of the major parties are not running the city for the welfare of the people and don't give a hoot about the city workers who are more and more regarding the city as a calloused exploiter.

The mayor and governor have been castigated by the civil service leaders for their arrogance toward the city workers. Yet these same civil service leaders have made no proposals of a deep-going character for raising the needed revenue to finance services and salaries.

To realize their demands the civil service employees will have to combine militant methods of struggle with an appeal to the whole organized labor movement to actively back their fight.

Atrocity Survivors

The faked atrocity stories recently issued by the U.S. command in Korea recall a real atrocity against prisoners of war — Koreans. This photo, issued by the Eighth Army headquarters, shows some of the less-badly wounded survivors of the massacre last December of unarmed Korean "civilian internees" by U.S. and South Korean guards on Pongam Island. 84 were killed, 118 seriously wounded for defying orders to stop singing "forbidden" songs.

SUPREME COURT DEFIED BY ATTORNEY GENERAL

(Continued from page 1)

Justice Douglas, also concurring, was doubtful about the legality of the entire procedure: "I do not see how the constitutionality of this dragnet system of loyalty trials which has been entrusted to the administrative agencies of government can be sustained." But he too said explicitly: "The gravity of the present charges is proof enough of the need for notice and hearing **BEFORE** the United States officially brands these organizations as 'subversive.'"

And Justice Black, who supplied the fifth vote for the majority decision against the Attorney General, flatly stated his opinion that "the executive has no constitutional authority, **WITH OR WITHOUT A HEARING,** officially to prepare and publish the lists challenged by petitioners. In the first place, the system adopted effectively punishes many organizations and their members merely because of their political beliefs and utterances, and to this extent smacks of a most evil type of censorship. This cannot be reconciled with the First Amendment as I interpret it."

A MOCKERY

In other words, Brownell's procedure, instead of "conforming" with the Supreme Court decision, is an evasion and defiance of both its spirit and its clearly spoken words.

More important, it is a mockery of traditional American standards of fair procedure and due process of law:

First he puts 254 organizations on his list and publicly smears them as "subversive." Then he tells them: If you don't like what I have done, then you have the "right" to protest and ask me for a hearing.

Who can have a grain of confidence in a procedure where the verdict is handed down before the trial? Who would trust his reputation or fate to a judge who tells you that he finds you guilty before you have even had your day in court? Who doesn't see that there is a vast distinction between a hearing and a FAIR hearing?

CLASS JUSTICE

As we were saying, the kind of justice you get depends on who you are and what you are doing. They can call it "equal justice" until they are hoarse. To us the only accurate title for such a system is "class justice."

Who is going to change this system?

Not the capitalist politicians and their two parties who benefit from the witch hunt against every independent group or voice that dares to challenge war preparations, exploitation, discrimination and regimentation.

And not the courts — not even the Supreme Court, which does not have the nerve to dissent when Attorneys General flout decisions in violation of their sworn oath to defend the Constitution and uphold the democratic rights of the American people.

The change won't even be started until the American people themselves unite militantly in defense of the Bill of Rights for all and act vigorously to check the Big Business drive to turn this country into a police state.

And the change won't be completed until the American people repudiate the capitalist two-party system and build an independent Labor Party designed to take over the government and run the country in the interests of the working people who built it and to whom it belongs.

Mexican Immigrants Pour Across Border

Illegal immigration of Mexicans seeking work in the United States has increased to such proportions that the border authorities consider it "overwhelming." In April an average of more than two a minute were apprehended and returned and these were only a small proportion of those who got by.

About 10% of the entire population of Mexico has already entered the U.S.

Wealthy ranchers and farmers are eager to hire Mexicans because their illegal status makes it difficult for them to fight for decent wages and working conditions.

According to a rumor circulating in Detroit labor circles, the CIO United Automobile Workers Union is considering establishing a daily labor paper.

FACTS REFUTE STORIES OF "INCOME REVOLUTION"

(Continued from page 1)

to the income of a mixed grouping — workers, middle class, small capitalists. From his figures, there is no way of knowing whether the relative increase in income which he claims for this group is due to a rise in the relative position in any one of its parts, or for all of them, or a decline for the working-class section offset by a bigger rise in middle-class and small-capitalist income. Fortunately, we do have some figures which show the trend for the working class.

WORKERS FALL BEHIND

The average wage or salary payment made in the U.S. per full-time worker has risen since 1929 by 138%. But at the same time, the national income per capita has risen by 161%, or far more. Thus the wage and salary payments have not been keeping up with the increase in national income, and the American workers and salaried employees have been falling behind.

Another way to check this is in the figures for the percentage of the national income going to each fifth of the population. The bottom two-fifths have been losing out since 1910. In 1910 they got 19.8% of the national income, and in 1949 they got 12%. The middle fifth gained a trifle (2%), while the second fifth from the top gained the most (5%) and the top fifth registered a slight gain.

CORPORATIONS GAIN

Still another way to check the division of the national income among the classes is by checking the percentage of the national income which the corporations have been getting. **In 1910, corporate profits were only 7.8% of national income, by 1929 they were 11.2%, and by 1951 had risen to 16.3%.**

But the biggest fallacy of all in Dr. Kuznets' figures is that they are inexplicable in any way other than as a statistical freak, the reasons for which I shall try to explain.

These figures do not correspond to anything that has been happening in the economy or in the real world, but reflect something which has been happening in the tax reports which formed the main basis for Dr. Kuznets' figures. Corporate income has not been taking a declining share of the national income, but a rising share. Labor income has been taking a falling share. Why then should figures be found which show the very opposite trend?

We must ask: What has been happening in the economy that is sharply different since 1939? There is only one answer that is relevant to our investigation: the tax laws. A supporter of Dr. Kuznets will immediately interject: But hold on, Kuznets shows the same trend even in the figures he gives for income before taxes. We know that, but it is the tax laws nevertheless that account for this statistical freak.

Since 1939-40, with the needs of the war economy, the taxes on personal incomes have gone up very steeply. At the present time, taxes on individual incomes can run as high as 87.2% of net income. However, and here is the important fact, taxes on corporate income only run in the neighborhood of 30%, and even together with surtax and excess profits tax can in no case exceed 62%.

INCOME CONCEALED

What this means in terms of dollars to the capitalist in the higher brackets is that, immediately upon transferring corporate profits into individual income, he loses a big hunk of it. **For this reason, each individual capitalist has been put in the position, since 1939, of trying to show as little personal income as he possibly can, for fear of losing a good part of it. Now, with each individual in the high-income bracket trying to do this, when multiplied by 600,000 individuals in the top 1%, the result is a "trend" — on paper.**

There is plenty of proof of this. Here is one example. When a corporation distributes payments to its shareholders, each payment is called a dividend. Between 1929 and 1948, dividends went up only 36%. Does this mean that corporations were making very little more money? Not at all. Corporate profits went up 152% after taxes. Were they spending it all on more factories? Not at all, because new plant and equipment building only rose at the same rate as profits after taxes. Where did it go? Well, undistributed profits rose fully 408%, or almost three times as fast as corporate profits. **They were hanging on to the money so that the tax collector would get less of it, and Dr. Kuznets got caught in the trap and decided that the rich were not getting richer as fast as they used to.**

TAX EVASION

Another way to evade taxes is to collect personal income, and find all sorts of ways not to report it. The worker can't do that, because his tax deduction is taken off right at the factory. But the capitalist, the landlord, the banker can find ways to do it, especially where he is reporting personal income.

Is this just conjecture? No, I can prove it. Here is one proof: The Department of Commerce puts out an estimate of adjusted gross personal income. The Treasury Department also puts out a figure for adjusted gross personal income, but it **bases that figure on what people are reporting** in their income tax returns, not on what they are really getting. Now, in 1948 the Commerce figure was $45 billion bigger than the Treasury figure. Even after you subtract the incomes of those people who don't have to report, such as soldiers, etc., there is still a big gap.

Who **makes the gap? National** Bureau of Economic Research (Dr. Kuznets' own organization) figures show the answer clearly. Ninety-five percent of all civilian wages and salaries were reported on income tax returns in 1946; only 5% got lost in the shuffle. But only 71% of the income from non-corporate businesses was exposed to the tax collector. Only 37% of interest payments to individuals was reported in 1946. Only 76% of dividend receipts was shown on income-tax reports in that year, and (you'd better check up on your landlord) only 45% of rents collected. There is no question that this widespread evasion mounted to great heights starting with the big income-tax rates at the beginning of World War II.

This is exactly the same time that Dr. Kuznets' "revolution" in incomes began. Perhaps there has been a revolution in the Bureau of Internal Revenue, which was Kuznets' chief source, but the real world has been going along about the same. **The rich are getting richer and the poor are getting poorer in relative terms; that is, when you consider their share of the national income.**

(For a fuller discussion of other aspects of this same topic, see **Fourth International,** March-April 1952, which contains an article I wrote when Kuznets' preliminary findings were issued. — H. F.)

The American Way of Life

The Case of Jandre Spehar

Jandre Spehar, aged 63 years, who worked for over 40 years in the coal mines of West Virginia, may have to find a new job in a new country. Unless Congress passes a special law in his behalf, he will be deported to Yugoslavia, which he left 47 years ago to come to the Land of Opportunity.

Although he was only 16 when he arrived he didn't go to school, he went right to work in the coal mines, where he found plenty of opportunity to work hard. Besides this he also slaved at the National Tube Co. plant.

In 1929, he joined the Communist party, thinking there was nothing wrong with such a political act. A year later he was jailed.

"The officers came to the mine and arrested me for being drunk," Spehar testified, "but I hadn't had anything to drink and I think they saw my $90 pay check. They tried to take the check from me, but I told them I would keep it and buy something to drink after I get out."

During the 47 days that he was kept in prison, the FBI ransacked his furnished room and found his Communist membership card. He freely admitted belonging to the party, saying he thought it was like belonging to the Democratic or Republican party.

"I knew something was wrong when they kept me in jail all that time on a drunk charge," Spehar states, "so that was enough of the party for me." He quit and never rejoined.

Fifteen years later in 1945, when he applied for U.S. citizenship, Spehar had dismissed the whole incident. However, when he came to that part of the application blank where it asks if you have ever been a member of the Communist party, he answered truthfully. He testified that he severed his relationship with the Communists after a brief 12-month period, during which he paid dues of 50 cents a month to a collector but didn't attend meetings.

In 1948 he was arrested by the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization.

At his trial, the government produced witnesses who testified he had told them of his Red connection at one time. The court ruled that Spehar should be deported. An appeal was denied. He was then instructed to appear in Pittsburgh for the purpose of finding whether he was planning to leave the country at his own expense.

"I told them I would pay my way, even though I had to borrow the money to do it," Spehar said, "and I have my ticket for the latter part of June, but I hope I don't have to use it."

Mr. Spehar is all alone in the world. He is 65 years old, and is living in two furnished rooms in Wheeling, West Virginia, on a pension of $100 a month from the mine workers' union. After paying for his passage, his savings amount to $500.

The only relatives he has in Yugoslavia are two nephews whom he has never seen and he says, "I don't know what I would do there because I'm too old to start all over again."

What does he mean "too old"? Isn't he indulging in self-pity just a little bit? He had his opportunity, didn't he? He was given 40 years of work in the coal mines and what did he do with his money? Among other things he squandered $6 on dues to the Communist party in 1929, and that shows he's un-American. Just ask one of the subversive committees. They'll tell you he's a real danger. He made his bed back in 1929 — now let him lie in it.

That's the American Way — as they see it.

— Joan Farr

THE MILITANT ARMY

San Francisco reports an excellent sale of literature in the recent weeks of campaign activity.

In addition to 355 copies of **The Militant** sold in door-to-door work along with leaflet distribution, encouraging results were obtained on the campus. **Paul Williams** describes the response of some of the students: "**Jim L.** sold two pamphlets, 'Egypt, A People Rising' and 'The Coming World Showdown,' to a young Latin American student who stopped cold when he heard Jim's 'Read a Trotskyist analysis of world events!' This student, who follows his home newspapers, was well acquainted with the revolution in Bolivia. He spoke most highly of it and was very happy to meet us.

"Two exchange students from India readily purchased the Pablo pamphlet, one of them stating his belief that revolutionary socialism is the only road for the Indian masses. Two young Egyptian girls who bought the Egypt pamphlet commented on its excellent statistical analysis of the distribution of the land in Egypt today.

"One young student, who works as a longshoreman and goes to school at the same time, supported our ideas on the need to build a labor party.

"All told, in three afternoons, **Jim L., George** and **Paul** sold over 25 **Militants.** Last week we also sold 10 of the fine pamphlets on Egypt, 21 of Pablo's 'Socialism or Capitalism,' 14 copies of **Fourth International,** two copies of Engels' 'Principles of Communism,' and two copies of 'Fascism, What It Is and How to Fight It,' by Trotsky. It certainly isn't difficult to sell socialist literature today. The response we're getting proves it!"

Minneapolis Literature Agent **Helen Sherman** writes, "With all the devoted energetic work from all the Twin Cities comrades on the sub campaign, we want to throw a few bouquets to very deserving comrades. **Evie,** with 962 points, came out tops in the Minneapolis Branch, second only to '1,000 point' Milt in the Twin Cities and in the national contest. She rounded up subs all over the city, brought in money for several complimentary subs, and shares honors with 'Captain' **Harry** for organizing and inspiring the Coover Scouts team to an outstanding 3,125 point total.

"The Marching Militants, winning first place in the Twin Cities contest with 3,154 points, salutes with pride and affection **Bob,** the highest scorer on the team, who kept plugging away, week in and week out, selling the paper and getting subscriptions in his neighborhood to come in second high in Minneapolis with 584 points. **Helen,** with 445 points, and **Ray, Harry, Larry,** and **Charlie** in the '300 point' bracket, brought in a number of new subs and renewals. **Dave, C. R.** and **Wally** went over the '200' mark, while **Walt, Pauline, Ches, Fanny** and **Prentice** contributed over 150 points each. Special credit goes to **Alice,** who only recently began selling **The Militant.** Her participation in the campaign, in spite of illness and other problems, is a real inspiration to us all."

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

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

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

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

Vol. XVII - No. 20 Monday, May 18, 1953

The Threat of McCarthyism

Let no one underestimate the threat of Senator Joseph McCarthy. They belittled Hitler too, at first. McCarthy is a sinister expression of fascist forces that lie just under the surface of American capitalist society and are ready to sprout under the first seasonable conditions.

McCarthy knows his political climate. He knows how favorable the times are for him and his breed. That is why he is now bold and brazen enough to extend his witch-hunting forays against even sectors of the capitalist press. He and his gang are out to terrorize into silence any publication to the left of his own fascist-like policies. That is the meaning of his attack on the liberal N. Y. *Post*.

Many people are already aware that McCarthyism must be fought. They are eager to launch a vigorous counter-attack. But, unfortunately, they will get little aid or inspiration from the example of James A. Wechsler N. Y. *Post* editor, in his responses to McCarthy's smear questions.

Wechsler did not dispute the "right" of the committee to wage its witch-hunting "investigations"; he affirmed that "right." He did not dispute McCarthy's request for names of alleged "Communists"; Wechsler turned over a list of such names, with the pitiable appeal that McCarthy be "fair." And, lest "defenseless people may be hurt" by his action of turning informer for McCarthy, Wechsler pleaded that "surely the proper thing" would be for the committee to hand over the list of names to the — FBI. That's one suggestion McCarthy will gladly heed.

Wechsler's "brave" stand, as his newspaper has tried to represent it, boils down to his objection to the fact that McCarthy smears some anti-communists as "Communists." But Wechsler did not disapprove the persecution and witch-hunting of real Communists. He just wants immunity from political victimization for himself and his associates.

That's the fatal weak spot of his kind of defense against McCarthyism. Once you accept the premise that it's all right to deny rights to even one political tendency, the principle of the witch hunt is upheld. Where does it stop? Wechsler wants it confined to a nice air-tight sanitary container marked "Real Communists." McCarthy says, "Fine! You're a real Communist, too. And anything you say will be used against you."

An effective fight against McCarthyism must begin with an understanding that the political rights and civil liberties of Communists or persons of any other unpopular political persuasion are as sacred as the rights of Republicans and Democrats. We must uphold the Bill of Rights for everyone without exception We must contest the "right" of the heresy-hunters and secret political police to investigate anyone for any political views. We must defend positively the rights of all.

Packinghouse Workers Call for Action

The CIO Packinghouse Workers Union again has lifted the trumpet of militancy to its lips and given a blast intended to rouse the whole American labor movement.

This is the second call to resound from the UPWA. Last month *The Militant* hailed the stand of the *Packinghouse Worker* for the bold statement it carried on the need to examine the vital issues confronting American workers — the issues of war and the steady destruction of political liberties. Then April 6 we said: "If the Packinghouse Workers Union carries on the fight in the spirit proclaimed in its important policy statement, it may well influence the entire American labor movement."

It is now clear that the UPWA *is* carrying on the fight in the very spirit of its original declaration. The General Executive Board of the union has issued a long statement going in detail into the problems of war and colonial revolts and the witch hunt; furthermore it comes up with specific criticisms and proposals.

On war: It criticizes the Korean War. Discussing the hopes of most Americans for a truce in Korea, it asks, "are there powerful forces still at work to keep the guns active; or if the guns are not active, at least to continue the tensions and fears which will keep the factories active producing guns?"

On colonial revolts: "All too often, and too consistently, when our nation has taken open sides, our leaders have aligned our forces alongside the imperialism of the world. We have refused to condemn the cruel repressions of the Malan government in South Africa. We have made it appear that our interests are on the side of maintaining French imperial control of Indo-China and British imperial control of Malaya."

On China: Chiang Kai-shek is "a discredited, ruthless and corrupt dictator overwhelmingly rejected by his own people," and China should be admitted to the UN.

On the witch hunt and McCarthyism: "We in the CIO . . . viewed with alarm the conviction of certain Communist leaders not for overt acts but for what they taught. But neither our union nor, so far as we are aware, any other national union either AFL or CIO, took a single concrete step by way of court briefs or otherwise to bring our views to a forum where they might produce results." "Only a wide-awake, uncowed labor movement will be able to meet this attack (McCarthyism) on all fronts. We, the International Executive Board of the UPWA-CIO, have decided that the time has come when the labor movement must speak and act on all fronts."

The Packinghouse Workers have taken a courageous second step in rising to the tasks that history has assigned to the organizations of the American working class in this critical period. Undoubtedly this step will be smeared by the witch hunters from outside the ranks of labor, assailed by the shortsighted, opportunistic and timid inside the ranks of labor. But let the Packinghouse leaders persist in their course and they will find more and more allies who, have had the same thoughts but feared to express them. Courage can be contagious.

Southeast Asia in Flames

Occasionally an article appears in the press that must make depressing reading for the big-money men who think in terms of safe foreign investments. For instance, the May 13 *Christian Science Monitor*, a paper which rates high for authentic information about foreign events, carries the following round-up under the gloomy head-line "Southeast Asia on Red Brink":

Indo-China — "Here the situation is worst of all." The whole country is "immobilized" economically. "Wide areas" are under direct Communist control, others are "under immediate threat." "Main reason for Viet-Minh success is widespread popular resentment of the continuing French overlordship. The Indo-Chinese from the humblest peasant to the nominal rulers of the three states — Viet Nam, Laos, and Cambodia — want full independence." Cambodia is "seething with unrest." The whole governmental structure set up in Indo-China by the French 'is in the process of collapse."

Thailand — The situation here "is admittedly perilous in the extreme." The army "is in no position to offer serious resistance to a well-organized Communist thrust from outside or a rising from within." And the "average Thailander shows little disposition to fight if such an attack or uprising should come."

Burma — This country faces "serious internal difficulties." As a matter of fact "civil war" has been raging for a long time, bringing "great internal tensions," preventing "needed reorganization of the national economy," and permitting "the infiltration of myriads of Communist agents."

Malay States — Some 5,000 guerrilla fighters have tied down 35,000 soldiers, sailors, and airmen, 68,000 policemen, and a home guard with a target total of 240,000. "Under such conditions one can only guess what would happen if the guerrilla forces were increased tenfold (by no means an impossibility) and if Chinese military equipment were poured in at a rate merely double that at present."

Indonesia — Not quuite so bad from the imperialist viewpoint, but latest reports indicate "an economic and political deterioration which elsewhere has played into Communist hands."

The general conditions causing this state of affairs in these countries is "general poverti and discontent on the part of millions of underprivileged citizens." This is coupled wit "lack of national development," "lingering resentment against the West" for "oppression in the past," and clever "communist propaganda."

That list of capitalist woes should cheer everyone in this country fighting the mounting police-state peril. Hundreds of millions of people in Southeast Asia are clearly on the march, seeking independence, freedom and a world of peace. Their mighty power counts as reinforcement in our own struggle, for they face the same Big Business interests that we face here at home.

Humanity is moving forward to the new world of socialism and nothing can stop them, not even the colossal strength and evil will of Wall Street.

McCarthy Smears the "Post"

By Art Preis

Senator Joseph McCarthy's growing power to intimidate and smear those who criticize him and his policies is shown again by his secret grilling of James A. Wechsler, editor of the N. Y. **Post**, an influential capitalist newspaper with nearly a half-million circulation. The star-chamber inquisition took place on April 24 and May 5 before closed hearings of the Senate Investigations subcommittee, headed by McCarthy.

His attack on the **Post** and its editor as "Communist" is intended as a threat to any newspaper that dares to cross him. This major assault on freedom of the press has brought expressions of alarm even from conservative papers like the **N. Y. Times** and **Christian Science Monitor.**

The **Post** and **Times** were able to secure transcripts of the proceedings. The published excerpts give an illuminating and frightening revelation of McCarthy's fascist-like methods. In this case, he did not hesitate to wield them against the editor of a big metropolitan newspaper which swings considerable weight, is strongly Democrat in its politics and bitterly anti-communist.

Wechsler had been briefly a member of the Young Communist League in his youth during the early depression Thirties. He had broken from the Communist (Stalinist) movement at the age of 22 and for a decade and a half has made a living out of "exposing" communism. He has done this, however, ostensibly as a liberal and the **Post** has attacked McCarthy's methods repeatedly.

As McCarthy's questions revealed, one of his objectives in "getting" the Post, through attacking its editor as a "concealed" Communist, is in reprisal for the paper's support of the former Democratic administration. McCarthy made it plain that the definition of "Communist" or "fellow-traveler" is now to be expanded to cover supporters of the Democratic Party and liberals in general, no matter how anti-communist.

The pretext for summoning Wechsler before the hearing was that he is one of the authors of books on the shelves of the Overseas Information Service. These books are under investigation for "Communist ideology." Not more than five minutes of the five-hour sessions were devoted to this matter.

At the start, Wechsler was questioned about the four books he had written. He informed the committee that the last two were anti-communist. Subsequently, he managed to break briefly into the questioning about the editorial policies and personnel of the **Post** to complain that "I have not been told which book of mine has been found."

DON'T KNOW

McCarthy replied sharply: "We have told you very clearly that we do not have the record of the number of your books and which of your books are on the shelves." McCarthy's legal counsel Cohn said: "The author's index indicates Mr. Wechsler's books are in use. That is for certain. Exactly which of them it is a practical impossibility at this point to know."

In short, McCarthy's committee didn't even know which books of Wechsler's were involved or whether they were pro-Communist or anti-Communist.

But it really didn't matter, because McCarthy was after different and bigger game. He quickly diverted the questioning into the editorial attitude of the **Post** toward him and other witch-hunting agencies of the government. He hurled one question afetr another along these lines at Wechsler.

"Do you have anyone working on the New York **Post** who were or are members of the Young Communist League or the Communist Party?"

"Have you been making attacks upon J. Edgar Hoover in the editorial columns of your paper?"

"Have you ever in your editorial columns, over the past two years, praised the FBI?"

"Is your answer that you do not recall at this time any praise of the FBI, but you do recall editorializing against the FBI?"

"Have you always been very critical of the heads of the House Un-American Activities Committee? You have always thought they were pretty bad men, have you not?"

"The principal villains in your book are those in the Congress

SEN. McCARTHY

who have gone about the job of exposing Communists. Is that correct?"

"And you are opposed to Bill Jenner, too. [Senator William E. Jenner, chairman of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.] You think he is a dangerous man?"

"Do you think Jenner is doing a good job?"

"Will you tell us what former member of the party, who has come up and testified against his former comrades you have ever found good in?"

Wechsler tried to parry McCarthy by boasting of his own anti-communism. He gave McCarthy a list of names of people he knew had once been Communists. He told how he supported the Marshall Plan and the Truman Doctrine. He spoke admiringly of Whitaker Chambers and denounced Alger Hiss. He insisted he had cooperated with the FBI in uncovering Communists.

But Wechsler hadn't stool-pigeoned enough to satisfy McCarthy. The Senator brushed his anti-Communist record aside.

A "real ex-Communist," snarled McCarthy, "does not spend his time, you see, trying to smear and tear down the people who are really fighting communists." And from the fact that Wechsler had criticized him and other witch-hunters McCarthy concluded:

"I feel that you have not broken with the Communist ideal. I feel that you are serving them very, very actively. Whether you are doing it knowingly or not, that is in your own mind. I have no knowledge as to whether you have a card in the party."

SENATORIAL IMMUNITY

From behind the barricade of his senatorial immunity to a libel suit, McCarthy also inserted into the record: "The **Post** has been, I think, the leader — next to **The Daily Worker** . . . in denouncing very vigorously and intemperately without regard to the truth at all, I think without exception, every man who has broken with the Communist party and appeared as a witness against spies and traitors."

Thus, to McCarthy, any person who breaks with the Communist Party and does not rush to the FBI to inform on his former comrades is still suspect and any newspaper that opposes McCarthyism, from any standpoint, is following the line of the **Daily Worker.**

McCarthy indicated that one of the big reasons for his harassment of Wechsler and smear of the Post is their support of the Democratic Party's candidates. When Wechsler explained his opposition to Henry Wallace in 1948 as an example of his anti-Communism, McCarthy answered: "Did you think there was danger of the Wallace party winning the elections or did you think that there was danger of the Wallace party taking enough votes so that the old Acheson crowd would be kicked out and exposed?"

It would not be difficult to point out innumerable absurdities in McCarthy's assertions during this harassment of his victim. For instance, he sneeringly asserted that "I do not read your sheet." Then he spoke about not interfering with the right of the **Post** to "distort and twist the news" and called Wechsler 'the ring leader in trying to assassinate the character of anyone who deserts the party and testifies against his former comrades." How he knew these thungs without even reading the **Post** he did not bother to explain.

He revealed he was not interested in the slightest in getting at the truth of the **Post's** views. When Wechsler offered to "submit to this committee every editorial written since I became editor," McCarthy snapped back: **"I do not think that I would care to read them."**

World Events

By Charles Hanley

THE LANKA SAMASAMAJA, Trotskyist party of Ceylon, scored encouraging gains in various local elections in April. In numerous villages, despite reactionary pressure from the big landlords, the Trotskyist candidates won absolute majorities and gained additional seats in legislative bodies.

* * *

THE LABOR PARTY chalked up a big victory in Britain's municipal elections which ended May 7. The Laborites ousted the Conservatives from control of two boroughs in London and eight other cities. Final results for England and Wales show that Labor won 417 seats, lost 54; the Conservatives won 85, lost 335; the Liberals won 9, lost 13; the Stalinists won 0, lost 7; and independent candidates won 28, lost 130.

* * *

FREEDOM-SEEKING Indo-Chinese troops are more solidly intrenched in Laos than ever before, according to **N. Y. Times** correspondent Henry R. Lieberman, writing from Hanoi May 9. "With about one-third of Laos in insurgent hands, Viet-Minh political workers are already organizing the populace in these areas under the banner of their leader, Ho Chi Minh." He adds that "the insurgents are believed to be setting up new bases for future operations directed toward the Mekong River, which forms the border with Thailand."

* * *

TARKHOV, Stalinist head of the Section for German Affairs in the Soviet Control Commission in Berlin, in a recent interview with Mrs. Klara Fassbender, leader of the "International Conference for a Peaceful Solution of the German Question," declared: "The Soviet Union favors free German elections under international control in the Western and Eastern zones. We are more than ever interested in the re-unification of Germany. We are even willing to withdraw our occupation forces behind the Oder; we are tired of being occupiers; we want to go home. The Soviet Union would recognize the results of a general election even in case of a right-wing, bourgeois victory. But we think that such a German government would find it difficult to abolish the nationalization of industry and the agrarian reform in the Soviet zone. The people would not tolerate such a change; but this question has to be solved by the Germans." Tarkhov said the Soviet Union is interested only in Germany's foreign policy. The pact between Bonn and the Western powers would have to be abrogated, as well as the treaty between East Germany and Poland. Poland and the Soviet Union would be prepared to make important economic and commercial concessions to a unified Germany, but the new Eastern frontier of Germany could hardly be changed because "too many Poles who formerly lived in the Ukraine have now settled in these territories (east of the Oder-Neisse line), and this does not permit a radical change." The interview appeared in the April 17 **Le Peuple** of Brussels.

* * *

THE CZECHOSLOVAK Government recently announced that "the Party and the State are taking steps to liquidate the remnants of capitalism . . . by depriving the former representatives of the capitalist order and their assistants, who helped suppress the struggle of the working class, of their pensions or by considerably reducing them."

* * *

FIRST PRISONER of the South African Malan regime under the new dictatorial laws against "passive resistance" to total segregation was a native, Arthur Matlala. Matlala was accused of the "crime" of talking with two other natives in the Negro "location" (compulsory ghetto) in Johannesburg. He is alleged to have said that the natives of South Africa should be "free" and of also saying that membership dues in the African National Congress are "two shillings six pence." Found guilty of these shocking crimes, Matlala was sentenced to suffer eight lashes, a year's imprisonment and a fine of $1,400.

* * *

IN JAMAICA, island of the West Indies largely inhabited by Negroes, the British authorities appear to fear an upsurge of sympathy for the people of Kenya seeking their freedom from oppressive British domination. Fred Wilmot, a popular radio announcer, was fired from his job because he wrote an article criticizing the "indiscriminate slaughtering of inarticulate Negroes in Kenya."

Where Did McCarthy Get the $144,000?

By Joseph Keller

Al Capone, king of the Chicago mobsters in the Prohibition era, once tried to show what an honest, patriotic citizen he was by a public denunciation of "communism." This did not prevent his imprisonment in Alcatraz for income-tax evasion. Professional thieves, however, generally stick to their own rackets and leave red-baiting to the professional witch hunters.

But a surprising number of professional red-baiters and witch hunters have been exposed as thieves, engaged as a profitable sideline in misappropriation of other people's money, particularly the public's. Anti-red Andrew J. Mays, wartime head of the House Military Affairs Committee, wound up behind bars because he became too careless in using his office to steer war contracts to a firm which paid him a fat fee.

Likewise, J. Parnell Thomas went from the chairmanship of the House Un-American Activities Committee to prison because he couldn't resist the temptation to flagrantly swindle the government.

There are some who insist that Senator Joseph P. McCarthy, the nation's present most distinguished professional red-baiter and witch hunter, differs from the pattern and is not a thief. There is about him, nevertheless, a strong odor of tainted money. His red-baiting, like that of his predecessors, covers a multitude of dollar bills.

McCarthy's predilection for the easy dollar — and plenty of them — is bared with considerable documentary detail in the report of the Senate Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections. Only 2,500 copies of this report were ever printed and powerful forces have been at work to keep it from wide circulation. The **New Republic** magazine, however, secured a copy and published its main contents.

REFUSED TO TESTIFY

McCarthy himself never dared to accept the Senate Subcommittee's invitation for him to appear before it and explain the sources of his not inconsiderable income above and beyond his Senatorial salary and expense allowance. McCarthy refused to testify, calling the charges against him a "Communist smear." He denied the Subcommittee's jurisdiction, but refused to accept the committee's challenge to raise the issue on the Senate floor.

The committee in turn challenged McCarthy on the issue and was upheld by a Senate vote of 60 to 0. McCarthy and his supporters were nevertheless able to threaten and pressure three members of the committee into resigning. But Senators Hennings of Missouri, Hayden of Arizona and Hendrickson of New Jersey submitted the report in January to the Senate and sent it for action to the Attorney General and Commissioner of Internal Revenue. None of these government bodies or agents has acted, however.

THOMAS V. O'SULLIVAN of public relations firm representing the Lustron Corp. testified that he advised Lustron's president that he was "ill-advised" to pay Sen. McCarthy $10,000 for a housing pamphlet.

One of the matters which the Senate Subcommittee closely scrutinized was the circumstances of the $10,000 fee paid McCarthy by the Lustron Corporation, manufacturers of pre-fabricated housing. He previously claimed he got the money for a pamphlet on housing although it was "not in publishable form" when McCarthy personally solicited and got $10,000 for it in Oct. 1948 from Carl Strandlund, then Lustron president. The report shows that McCarthy was in a desperate personal financial situation at that time due to his "over-extended debt position" on bank loans for his speculations. It further indicates McCarthy's services to Lustron previously in securing RFC loans totalling $37,500,000. (The Lustron venture proved a failure and the government's loss is reported in excess of $30,000,000.)

PROVOCATIVE QUESTIONS

The Subcommittee raised the provocative questions: **"Did Senator McCarthy take advantage of Lustron's sensitive position and its need for continued government financing to induce its president, Carl Strandlund, to pay a fee, set by him at $10,000, for a manuscript that was neither finished nor in publishable form?**

"Was there any connection between Senator McCarthy's recommendations for government aid to prefab manufacturers and his subsequent contacts with Lustron, which culminated in his receiving $10,000 for the sale of his manuscript?"

The Subcommittee presented evidence in its report that McCarthy had solicited and secured large sums from wealthy businessmen and manufacturers for the purpose of "fighting communism"; that most of these sums went into McCarthy's personal bank accounts; and that some of these monies appear to have been used for personal speculations through dummy agents. One such speculation, involving the sum of $10,000, occurred in soy beans, and netted a profit of $17,354.50. This was at a time, in Sept. and Oct. 1950, when McCarthy was in a position to benefit from confidential government information available to him.

SECRET SOURCES

According to the findings of the Subcommittee, McCarthy was able to deposit $172,623.18 from Jan. 1, 1948, to Nov. 12, 1952, precisely in the period of his ascendency as a Senate witch hunter. Of this amount deposited in McCarthy's own name, the committee was unable to identify the source of $59,592.52. Similarly, McCarthy's administrative assistant Ray Kiermas in the same period deposited $96,921.26, of which $44,908.43 could not be traced as to source. Going back through 1946, the committee found a total of $144,501.84 of income whose source could not be traced.

The report is especially damaging to McCarthy in relating large-scale financial favors, which he secured from financial interests connected with the housing, sugar and China Lobby, to occasions when McCarthy "disinterestedly" favored special legislation and government policies of aid to these interests.

It may be that McCarthy acted from unselfish patriotic motives. In that case, however, the arm of coincidence would have had to be very, very long indeed.

THE MILITANT

VOLUME XVII — MONDAY, MAY 18, 1953 — NUMBER 20

The Negro Struggle

Let's Keep Our Balance

By Jean Blake

The recent U.S. Supreme Court decision declaring white primaries in Fort Bend County, Texas, unconstitutional, coming so close to the 44th annual convention of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, recalls a similar situation a few years ago.

Then, too, a favorable Supreme Court decision in some NAACP cases preceded the convention. Leaders of the organization who should know better turned the Boston conference into an orgy of self-congratulation, hailed the decisions as sounding the death-knell of Jim Crow, and utilized the occasion to weaken the independence and internal strength of the NAACP.

The form this took was (1) watering down the organization's previously strong stand against the government "loyalty" program and witch hunt, (2) passing a resolution granting the leadership the power to conduct an internal witch hunt, and (3) utilizing the "victory" as justification for the policy of depending on "friends" in the administration and court action, rather than on militant campaigns of mass action and political independence to fight Jim Crow on all fronts.

The events since that convention warrant a more sober approach to the annual gathering this year, a more realistic evaluation of NAACP policies, and adoption of a more effective program.

First there was the wave of violence against Negroes across the country in 1951, highlighted by home-bombings, the murder of Mr. and Mrs. Harry T. Moore in Florida and the Cicero police-led hate action in Illinois. Then there was the contemptuous treatment of colored voters by both the Democratic and Republican parties in the 1952 elections.

In 1953 we have seen the "economy-minded" Republican administration not only ignore Negroes completely in all major appointments, but dispense with many race-relations agencies as "expendable." Federal agencies have conspired with New York police to ignore protests against brutal treatment of minorities, and the Federal court in Washington recently ruled that segregation of Negroes in public housing projects is constitutional.

In a report released May 3 by the American Jewish Congress and the NAACP it was admitted that the federal and state governments did little during 1952 to reduce racial and religious inequality, and that the last Congress demonstrated "not mere indifference but active opposition to racial and religious equality."

In view of all these facts, it is to be hoped that the NAACP at its forthcoming convention will not be carried away by the small, purely legalistic victory in the Texas primary case. Instead, a sober assessment of gains and losses should be made, and a program adopted to mobilize the membership and enlist the ranks in the struggle against Jim Crow in every pore of our society.

I Can't Relax

By Jack Bustelo

I get the impression that quite a few people are seriously thinking about relaxing for a change. They like this talk in the papers about a possible truce in Korea and maybe a breather before the atom bombs start dropping.

I'll admit it would really feel good to unwind and forget about the war preparations and the chance we'll be converted into radioactive ashes in the near future. But I'm not sure it isn't just another "peace scare," to use the language of the stock speculators and war profiteers. Tomorrow it may be all off, the "scare" ended and everyone back to the humdrum normalcy of awaiting atomic disintegration at any moment.

Even if they go through with it and give us a reprieve before starting World War III, I'm not sure of a release from tension.

The other day, for instance, a front page headline in **The Christian Science Monitor** wound me up still tighter with the warning: "CROP SURPLUSES POSE NEW THREAT!"

It seems that we face the frightening perspective of bumper crops this year. This doesn't mean more food and cheaper prices as you might suspect. It might mean disaster. Only if we're lucky enough to run into a spell of bad weather, a drought, floods or some other farm calamity can we hope to avoid the danger. That's the way capitalism works.

Of course, the government is doing everything possible to save us. In 1950 Washington had nearly $4,000,000,000 tied up in crops purchased to keep prices up artificially and was spending at the rate of $10,000,000 a day to take farm products off the market to create scarcities. This year the government by Feb. 28 was obligated to spend nearly $3,000,000,000 and now comes the shocking news about the unusually good crops.

Butter, for example, is going into government barrels at the rate of nearly 25,000,000 pounds a month. Since last December 166,000,000 pounds of cheese have been stockpiled. And the dairy farms report abnormally high milk production can be expected to continue.

Suppose such over-production does not land us in a depression that puts a high percentage of us in employment office lineups. We're still not free from worry.

All that money spent by the government to keep up prices has to come out of someone's pocket. You know whose pocket. The government has to maintain the tax gouge if it expects to continue buying surpluses in order to hold the prices of things you buy at stratospheric levels.

So if "peace" comes, can depression be far behind — or at least an increase in payroll deductions? The capitalist system simply won't let you relax. It's not built that way.

Notes from the News

CHILD LABOR. The U.S. Department of Labor reveals that 21% of the 2,888 children found working on cotton farms in the South and Southwest last year were nine years old or younger.

* * *

LUSH PROFITS of the oil corporations in 1952 are revealed by the CIO Oil Workers newspaper. A study of the figures of 36 leading companies shows that profits per man-hour of labor employed were in most cases over $1, with some companies hitting $4.10, $5.55 and, in the case of Texas Pacific, $8.32. The highest labor costs paid by any company — Sun — amounted to less than one-fifth of the money taken in by that company. In several cases net profits were greater than the whole wage bill. Most companies made well over 10% on their total investment with several making over 20%.

* * *

A JEWISH FRATERNITY chapter at Columbia University voted to split from the national organization of Zeta Beta Tau because the national charter barred Negroes from membership.

* * *

THE MAYOR, CITY CLERK and three aldermen of Rockford, Ill., are all CIO or AFL union members, elected on the "People's Coalition" ticket which had strong labor backing in the recent municipal elections.

* * *

ODIOUS. Ex-Congressman Fred K. Hartley, Jr., recently told the House Labor Committee that the law he sponsored along with Senator Taft and which bears his name (Taft-Hartley Law) should be kept, but that its name should be changed because the "names of its authors have become a symbol of evil in the minds of many American workers."

* * *

THE NAACP has asked Secretary of Defense "GM" Wilson for permission to interview Negro veterans of Korea, now being held at Valley Forge Army hospital for "brain-washing." These men are part of the group of returned prisoners of war that army authorities have accused of succumbing to Chinese and North Korean ideas.

* * *

LAST INSTALLMENT. A. J. Glover, who in past weeks has been reported in this column as being forced to resign as president of the AFL Switchmen's Union of North America and then repudiating his resignation and firing the executive-board members who had forced his resignation, has been replaced as president of the union. A special convention of the Switchmen met in Buffalo and elected a complete new administration headed by William A. Fleete.

* * *

20-HOUR WORK WEEK in near future predicted by Dr. Lillian M. Gilbreth, internationally famous industrial engineer, before the Society for the Advancement of Management in Washington, D. C. With increased mechanization, and taking the drudgery out of work, the U.S. should be able to produce enough for itself and the rest of the world on a 20-hour week, Dr. Gilbreth said. It's possible technically, but only a powerful socialist movement can make it possible politically.

* * *

ANOTHER LABOR HATER in Congress is former Governor Tuck of Virginia. Filling a unexpired term in the House of Representatives, Tuck has already demanded a seat on the House Labor Committee. His views are well summarized in a speech he gave to the cheering delegates at a United States Chamber of Commerce meeting recently. He told how he had "handled" unions during his term of office in Virginia. He broke a ferry strike by state seizure; he blocked unionization of state employees by threat of firing and blacklists; he smashed a coal miners' strike with state guards; he forestalled a utility strike by ordering the utility workers drafted into the state militia to be kept at work under threat of court martial. With such references Rep. Tuck looks like a natural for the job he is applying for on the House Labor Committee.

* * *

PACIFIST Richard Kern, who was brutally beaten by police for distributing anti-war leaflets during a practice air raid last September, has been convicted of attacking the policemen who arrested him. Kern filed a civil suit for damages against the City of New York and refused a deal offered him — that if he would drop his suit the police would drop their charges. $500 is needed to appeal Kern's conviction and the Kern Defense Fund, Room 825, 5 Beekman St., N. Y. 38, N. Y., is asking for contributions.

* * *

JOHN G. WRIGHT, Marxist authority on the Soviet Union, asks any of our readers, knowing where files or individual copies of Russian Communist youth periodicals, especially those of Leningrad and Moscow, for the years 1923-1929 can be obtained or read in this country, to please get in touch with him. The material is needed for completion of historical research work he is engaged in. He can be reached by writing him in care of **The Militant.**

Foes of Ohio Police-State Bill Muzzled

CLEVELAND, May 11 — The right of citizens to peacefully petition legislative bodies was reduced to a farce at Ohio House Judiciary Committee hearings in Columbus last Wednesday on a half-dozen "anti-subversive" bills. Representatives of the State CIO and of the Cleveland Civil Liberties Union were granted only five minutes each to speak against the measures, then harassed with hostile questions as to their authority, legitimacy, loyalty and motives.

The Judiciary Committee could hardly be distinguished from the witch-hunting Ohio Un-American Activities Commission when a spokesman for the Ohio Civil Rights Congress attempted to testify. Reminding him that he had refused to testify at the OUAC probe in Cincinnati, where he claimed his constitutional immunity under the Fifth Amendment, committee members again questioned him on his beliefs and associations, and threatened to have him thrown out for trying to make a speech when he chose to speak instead of his views on the significance of the anti-subversive bills.

Attorney John Rooney, presenting the statement of opposition for the State CIO, was questioned as to whether he really represented the CIO. He assured the committee he was presenting the statement at the express direction of the Ohio CIO Council, representing 500,000 men and women in the State. **His prepared statement was accepted for the record, but he was not permitted to present it orally, or to discuss it for more than five minutes.**

Attorney Charles R. Miller of the Cleveland Civil Liberties Union was similarly restricted and the motives of the American Civil Liberties Union were impugned when he attempted to present his statement.

Both statements attacked House Bill 308, the omnibus bill introduced by Rep. Devine, chairman of the Ohio Un-American Activities Commission, as unnecessary and dangerous.

Miller's statement quoted from the veto message of Adlai Stevenson, then Governor of Illinois, rejecting the Broyles anti-subversive bill in that State, and from the decision of Federal Judge Luther Youngdahl, former Republican Governor of Minnesota, in the Lattimore case, on the need to "preserve inviolate the constitutional rights of free speech, free press and free assembly in order to maintain the opportunity for free political discussion."

A statement to the committee by the Socialist Workers Party of Ohio, reported in the last issue of **The Militant,** was not referred to at the hearing.

Indications are that the witch hunters will light the faggots under any legislators daring to oppose this police-state measure. These legislators need help.

What is needed, and needed soon, is a broad, united opposition by labor and liberal forces to let the law-makers know in no uncertain terms that the people of Ohio don't want this Hitler-type measure or anything resembling it.

Don't Want U.S. Troops

Japan's sovereignty as an independent nation is supposed to have been restored, but these May Day demonstrators in Tokyo carrying signs, "U.S. Go Home," show how millions of Japanese feel about the continued quartering of a large body of American soldiers in the supposedly free country.

STELLATO SLATE WINS FORD 600 ELECTIONS

DETROIT, May 9 — In the recent elections of CIO United Automobile Workers Ford Local 600 at the huge River Rouge plant, incumbent president Carl Stellato was re-elected by a vote of 20,139 to 8,400 for Gene Prato, the hand-picked candidate of UAW President Walter Reuther. Pat Rice, the incumbent vice-president who ran for president as an independent, received 2,535 votes. All but one of Stellato's slate were elected by a better than two-to-one margin.

The Ford workers rallied around the openly-organized opposition to Reuther in the teeth of a triple-threat posed by the Ford Motor Company, federal government and the top UAW leadership.

A run-off election will be held next week for Recording Secretary, the only office still in doubt. Bill Hood, the incumbent, ran on the Reuther ticket against Bill Johnson of the Stellato Unity Slate. Hood, who up to the elections was also national head of the National Negro Labor Council, received 11,141 votes to 13,796 for Johnson, who had been chairman of the Dearborn Iron Foundry unit, which employs Negro workers mainly.

FOUGHT FOR PROGRAM

The substitution of Orr and Johnson, both long-time leaders of the Progressives, on the Unity Slate in place of Rice and Hood in no way reflected a retreat from the program pushed by Local 600 at the last UAW convention. This same program — opposition to long-term contracts, for union democracy, for the 30-hour week at 40 hours pay, etc. — laid the basis for the overwhelming victory of the Unity Slate.

These election results have more than justified the Local 600 leadership's confidence in their program, which they maintained even after the "trial by red-baiting" they suffered at the UAW convention. Numerous delegates had indicated to Stellato at that time their sympathy with his program. This points the way to establishment of an opposition inside the UAW based not only on the solid backing of the Ford workers but on rank-and-filers throughout the union whose support is needed to make the Local 600 program a reality.

The elections for officers of the units, somewhat in contrast to the voting for local-wide offices, sounded a certain warning note. Although the incumbents in the units, for the most part Stellato supporters, were re-elected in all but one case, their margins were by no means as decisive as that of the Local slate. The Reutherites won the election of unit officers in the Iron Foundry, although Stellato himself got a majority of the Iron Foundry votes. The campaign of the Iron Foundry Reutherites was based, for the most part, on the failure of the incumbent unit officers to take effective action to improve working conditions, fight speed-up, etc., in their particular unit.

BROADEN STRUGGLE

It has become clear that the Local 600 leadership must not only broaden the base of the struggle for its program, if it is not to remain merely on paper; but the leaders must wage a continuous daily fight for improvement of the Ford workers' conditions.

To this end, the membership and executive board of the Motor Building have unanimously approved the institution of a job-steward system — "a steward for every foreman" — as a first step in an effective battle against speed-up. This proposition commends itself to the careful study of the Local 600 leadership.

Civil Liberties Threatened by New Illinois Bill

CHICAGO, May 5 — In the latest attack on civil liberties in Illinois, Bills 101 and 102, known as the Broyles Bills, have been adopted by the state Senate. These police-state measures will now go to the House for a first reading after which they will be referred to a House Committee for public hearings. It is believed that the hearings will begin on May 12 and that the bills will go to a vote in the house shortly thereafter.

Thirty-two organizations testified against the Broyles bills during the Senate hearings and six organizations spoke for the bills. Among those opposing were the American Civil Liberties Union, the League of Women Voters and the Chicago Bar Association.

Bill 101 would create an investigating commission with ample funds and full powers of subpoena "to investigate any activities . . . of any persons . . . which are suspected of being directed towards the overthrow of the government of the United States or the State of Illinois."

Bill 102 is an omnibus (catch-all) thought-control measure which pretends to aim at nobody save "communists and traitors," as American Legion spokesman Clamage asserted, but it is, in fact, so sweeping that it has already frightened the entire liberal element in Illinois and has even brought frowns from extreme conservatives, who fear its reckless approach to the "loyalty question." Governor Stratton is reported to have intimated that he would veto the bills if they were passed in their present forms.

Bill 102 defines a "subversive organiation" as "any organization which engages in, or advocates . . . activities intended to overthrow — or to assist in the overthrow or destruction of the constitutional form of government of the U.S. or of the State of Illinois, or of any political subdivision — by force, violence, or other unlawful means."

A "subversive person" is defined as anyone who commits or attempts to commit any of the proscribed acts or who is a member of an organization defined as "subversive." Violation of this law would entail penalties up to $20,000 fines and 20 years imprisonment.

A particularly vicious section of this bill deals with state employees. Any functionary in a supervisory capacity would be empowered to decide if there were "reasonable grounds for believing" employees or prospective employees to be "subversive as defined by the act." Thus the job rights of state workers would be put at the mercy of every political straw boss on the state payroll.

The Chicago Bar Association, commenting on this section of the Broyles Bill, declared: "It is possible that a person could be found to be subversive under these provisions solely because he belonged to an organization which the employing agency (but no one else) conceived to be a subversive organization."

The American Civil Liberties Union stated: "The declaration in the bill that membership in a subversive organization is in itself a felony apart from any specific acts of subversion on the part of the individual, is the culmination of a startling legislative development over the past six years. This guilt by association doctrine first gained popularity in the federal loyalty program and the promulgation of the Attorney General's list. For that purpose, membership in an organization was first conceived to be some, but not complete evidence of disloyalty justifying the discharge of a federal employee. Once the Attorney General's list was promulgated, the pressure of this trend tended toward insuring that mere membership in any such organization was conclusive not refutable evidence of disloyalty. The final step is to make membership not only conclusive evidence of disloyalty foreclosing a member from public employment but a crime."

In passing the Broyles Bills the state Senate adopted six amendments, some of which were even proposed by witch hunter Broyles himself, probably in deference to Governor Stratton's warning. However, it is clear that these amendments are merely to smooth the path of the police-state measures through the legislative mill. The ACLU comments that these amendments "have not changed the nature of the bills or eliminated many glaring faults . . . which confirms our suspicion that an unconstitutional test-loyalty oath was in the minds of the drafters."

Judge's Decision In Lattimore Case Hits Witch Hunt

(Continued from page 1)

Lattimore has been the number-one target of Senator McCarthy, who called him the "top Soviet agent" in the U.S. and who said that he would "stand or fall" on Lattimore's guilt. McCarthy and McCarran have tried to drive out of politics anyone who stood in the way of their politically profitable persecution of Lattimore.

Thus, when Senator Millard Tydings of Maryland headed a Senate investigation of McCarthy's charges against Lattimore and pronounced them groundless, McCarthy successfully undertook to drive Tydings out of national politics.

It has long been rumored that McCarran's price for voting for the confirmation of Attorney General McGranery, Truman's last Attorney General, was the institution by McGranery of this perjury case against Lattimore.

As the **N. Y. Times** hints in its final paragraph in the story on Judge Youngdahl's decision, the McCarthyites will not let the judge escape their fury. This former Republican Governor of Minnesota, conservative in his politics, has committed the crime of believing the Bill of Rights and due process of law to be still in effect. For the witch hunters that is a form of "communist thinking."

Marcantonio, Stalinists Argue ALP Role

By Michael Bartell

The American Labor Party, New York State affiliate of the Progressive Party, appears to be heading for a major internal conflict over the question of the future of the party.

On April 29, Vito Marcantonio, state chairman, in a prepared speech delivered to a city-wide ALP conference, accused the Stalinists of proposing "to surrender the fight" and "liquidate our party" and announced that he would "accept the challenge" and "let the enrolled voters decide the question on Primary Day." The issue in dispute is whether the ALP shall run independent candidates in the 1953 municipal elections in New York, or support "good government" coalition candidates.

Insisting that the ALP "must nominate candidates for all of the major offices to be elected in the municipal elections in New York City in 1953," Marcantonio charged: "Those who have abandoned the cause of a third party . . . would urge upon us not to nominate candidates. . . Not to nominate candidates under these circumstances is liquidation by indirection."

Although Marcantonio did not mention the Stalinists by name, referring throughout his speech to "some," "they," "those who," etc., there was no mystery as to who "they" and "those" were, since this dispute has been smoldering for a year, and the **Daily Worker** is currently whooping it up for a "good government" "anti-Tammany" coalition candidate for mayor, and warning against the dangerous left deviation of "go-it-aloneism."

This conflict is an expression of a far deeper crisis that has overtaken the Progressive Party. The crisis is the result of the failure of the PP to build a mass liberal third party which could challenge the two parties of Big Business. This failure is recognized by the entire party. Referring to the Stalinists, Marcantonio said: "They say we have experimented with the third party and that it has failed. They tell us the vote which the third party received in 1952 was inconsequential." Far from taking issue with this estimate, he concurs in it: "This is true. . ." But he took issue with the Stalinists "in the discernment of the cause and the solution offered by them."

POSITION OF STALINISTS

The Stalinists "discern" the cause roughly this way: The entire venture was a mistake. It was impossible to build a mass "people's" party without the support of the trade unions, the mass organizations of the Negro people, etc. Therefore — it was wrong for the "progressives" to isolate themselves from the masses whose organizations remained tied to the Democratic party. Their "solution" is to declare bankruptcy and liquidate their rapidly dwindling assets into the Democratic party with the aim of merging with the "progressive forces" which would eventually emerge as an independent Labor Party.

In short, the incurably unprincipled and opportunist Stalinist leaders are going to do their bit to deliver the workers' votes to corrupt, witch-hunting, war-mongering capitalist politicians, as they (together with Marcantonio) did in their "people's front" heyday when they campaigned for such "honest" "pro-labor" politicians as O'Dwyer. There is this difference however: Whereas they got paid off then for their sell-out with jobs and other favors, now their support will be contemptuously repudiated and they will be rewarded with a kick in the teeth.

Marcantonio apparently sees no percentage in such one-way deals. He rejects coalition with the Republican, Democratic or Liberal parties because they are "as one in operation for the profit of the big and mighty at the expense of the little people." "It is significant," he continues, "that not a single leader of any one of these three machines, either in the upper or lower echelons, has at any time expressed any word of opposition on the great fundamental issue of peace." "Essentially," he concludes, "they are the same. They may use different fiddles but they play the same tune."

MORE OF THE SAME

However, Marcantonio had no alternative solution to the dilemma — other than to keep on doing what they're doing. He admits that thus far they have failed, but guarantees that all that is going to change now. The dark days are over, he contended, because "the forward march of the common people . . . has at long last resumed its course."

But the fact is that the PP, far from experiencing a resurgence, continues to decline and disintegrate, and all indications are that it will continue to do so until it falls apart. Furthermore, it is certain that when labor really does resume its forward march, and move into the political arena in its own name, it will not be through the PP, but through the formation of a Labor Party based on the trade union movement.

Thus, Marcantonio's "solution" offers no way out of the impasse. The alternatives presented to the members of the ALP are slow death or suicide. This insoluble dilemma has its source in the very political premises of the organization. **Marcantonio rested the entire** justification for the existence of the PP on the struggle "to sustain the affirmative" on this issue: whether or not our country can live at peace with the Soviet Union, China and other countries whose economic, political and social systems vary fundamentally from ours."

Thus, the program — **the ultimate objective** — of the PP, is not the abolition of the decadent capitalist system with its inevitable wars, depressions, and injustice, but the reform of "our" capitalist "social system" into a peaceful, progressive society operating presumably not for the "big and the mighty," but for the "little people."

DECLINE IS INEVITABLE

The PP faces inevitable decline because it has no stable foundation either in the organized mass of the working class or in the program and historic aspirations of the class, i.e., socialist emancipation. It is neither fish nor fowl. It has neither the virtue of a genuine Labor Party which is the political expression, however inadequate, of the working class and all the oppressed, nor of a small but principled socialist movement which organizes, educates and prepares the conscious vanguard for the task of leading the working class to victory in the social upheavals that lie ahead.