

# Millions Will Die, All Liberty Lost -- McMahon Admits

By John G. Wright

There are few individuals in this country who are in a better position to speak on the subject of the Hell-Bomb arms race and its consequences than Senator Brien McMahon, chairman of the Congressional Atomic Commission. That is why so much importance attaches to the speech he made to the Senate on Feb. 2.

The Democratic Senator from Connecticut, who can get his information at first hand, stated that the Hell-Bomb would offer this country no security whatever least of all any "monopoly." Even if Washington wins the race to stockpile such bombs first, "it is only a matter of time — and possibly a short time — before the Kremlin achieves success also," McMahon affirmed.

There is no defense against the Hell-Bomb, any more than there is against the now "outmoded" A-Bomb. The Hell-Bomb makes virtually certain the destruction of "the largest city on earth" and as many as fifty million Americans could be "incinerated in the space of minutes," he flatly stated.

The end result of this "truly terrible arms race," warned the Senator, must be "war — under today's conditions, hydrogen war."

Here you have in so many words a public admission that the capitalist rulers of this country have already placed in direct jeopardy the lives of all children and adults at home and abroad. McMahon then went on to admit that the mere production of the Hell-Bomb would involve in a direct and immediate sense the destruction of each and every democratic right and all elementary civil liberties.

## 'IMITATE TOTALITARIANS'

McMahon cited "the restrictions on freedom already brought about by the atomic bomb and by its pressures upon us to accept loyalty checks, espionage counter-measures, and widening areas of official secrecy." Under the Hell-Bomb, all these "pressures" will be multiplied one-thousand fold, McMahon insisted.

Speaking with rare frankness, he told his colleagues: "If you are candid and realistic, I believe you will find it is difficult indeed to see a dominant role for freedom in such a picture. To stay alive we will find ourselves more and more compelled to imitate the totalitarian rival."

The truth is there is no way of forcing the mass of the American people to accept "incineration" by the Hell-Bomb other than by first herding them into a vast and universal concentration camp, that is, instituting prior to the outbreak of war itself, a "reign of repression that will make the methods and practices of fascism 'humanitarian' by comparison. That is the full meaning of McMahon's words concerning the alleged need to 'imitate the totalitarian rival.'"

## ANOTHER WARNING

A few days after McMahon's speech, there came another warning about the Hell-Bomb regime at home. It was made on Feb. 6 by Hanson Baldwin, military expert of the N. Y. Times, who also cited "the danger to freedom and to all our past concepts of democracy" inherent in the "greater and greater security restrictions" flowing from the atomic arms race.

Secrecy, warned Baldwin, does not provide security. All it provides is a cover for the arbitrary assumptions of power which, according to Baldwin, have already brought this country "dangerously close in several fields to... government in camera [read: naked dictatorship] in which momentous decisions affecting our lives and liberties were made without the knowledge — and every day the concurrence — of the people."

Let us recall that these unheard-of admissions and protestations come from the lips not of opponents of capitalism but its staunchest defenders.

The American people and the peoples the world over must beware of illusions today more than ever before in history. Among the most pernicious of illusions is that somehow, some way, mankind can be miraculously saved, before the fiery curtain of the Hell-Bomb descends, by crusaders for "peace," "humanitarianism," "morality," and the like.

The whole history of capitalism has demonstrated beyond a shadow of doubt that "pacifism," "humanitarianism," and all the

(Continued on page 3)

## WHAT OTHER STRIKERS SAY

DETROIT — While the capitalist press and radio are filled with attacks on John L. Lewis and the miners, here is what the striking Chrysler workers in Detroit are saying: "Labor ought to stick together. I don't agree with Lewis' politics but he's a man who always fought for the rights of the men. There should be solidarity."

"I think we should stand behind them and get as good contracts as they get before," said another Chrysler picket, while a third added: "I think there should be united action. If we're going to be union men we should have united labor. If you're hurt, I'm hurt."

Flying squadron members were bitter against Truman's anticipated use of Taft-Hartley. Among their comments were: "If miners are forced back to work it would be a blow to all of labor."

"If they do, the whole U. S. labor should go out." "Taft-Hartley is written so that any employer can do anything unfair, illegal, illegitimate — that's their idea of equality under the law."

"As far as I can see, the whole Taft-Hartley should be shoved in a furnace and burned."

"Lewis is right saying no three strangers should decide what we get. We're workers and can't do anything else but work, and we know what we need."

"I'm from Missouri myself and I know Truman's politics. I think he's only wooing labor — a political opportunist. He can't be trusted."

"I'm for everyone that's for labor. If he's not for labor, he's not for me. If Truman uses Taft-Hartley, I won't vote for him again."

Vol. XIV - No. 7

NEW YORK, N. Y., MONDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1950

PRICE: FIVE CENTS

# All Unions Must Take Action To Halt Attack Upon Miners

## THE MINERS' FIGHT IS YOUR FIGHT

An Editorial

The action of the CIO United Steel Workers in sending \$500,000 for the relief of the coal miners is a welcome first step in labor's fight against Truman's Taft-Hartley attack on the mine workers.

This reflects not so much a wholehearted desire by Philip Murray to aid the miners as the mounting pressure of the CIO rank and file. They feel a deep sense of solidarity with the miners and know that a defeat for the UMW will open the way for an offensive against their own unions.

At the first threat of the use of the Taft-Hartley Law, all American labor should rise as one to fight this deadly menace to their rights and liberties. All that is needed is a signal from the AFL and CIO leaders. But that signal has been withheld.

The reason is not hard to find. These union leaders are trying desperately to protect Truman. Murray has not yet said one word against Truman for invoking the Slave Labor Law against the miners. Murray is still unwilling to summon an all-out struggle by the CIO workers, for that means an open fight against Truman himself. But that is the kind of fight that must be made.

It will be made only if the union ranks force their unwilling leaders to act.

Demand that they publicly denounce Truman's T-H strikebreaking!

Demand that they extend continuous, unstinting financial and all other material aid to the miners!

Demand that they promptly convene a National Emergency Conference of Labor to launch nation-wide joint action by all unions on behalf of the miners!

## 'Miners Will Continue Struggle'



United Mine Workers President John L. Lewis (left) tells reporters that "the miners will continue their struggle to achieve justice." He made this statement after the mine operators walked out of renewed negotiations in Washington within 48 hours of Truman's proposal for a 70-day "truce" and "fact-finding." The owners took this as their cue to stall once more in the hope — since fulfilled — that Truman would intervene on their behalf with the Taft-Hartley Law.

## Kutcher Case Is Taken Into Washington Court

WASHINGTON, D. C., Feb. 9 — The government's "loyalty" program was challenged as unconstitutional and contrary to proper judicial procedure in a crucial civil suit filed today by the legless veteran, James Kutcher, in the U. S. District Court at Washington.

Kutcher's attorneys, M. J. Myer of Chicago and Joseph L. Rauh Jr. of Washington, requested a mandatory injunction directing the Administrator of Veterans Affairs to restore Kutcher to his clerk's job in the Newark VA. Kutcher, who lost both legs in battle in Italy in 1943; was fired from his job in October 1948 solely because of admitted membership in the Socialist Workers Party.

At a press conference today it was emphasized that Kutcher was refused any hearing on the main issue involved in his discharge, namely, whether or not the Socialist Workers Party actually advocates violent overthrow of the government. Both Kutcher and his party deny that they are "subversive" or advocate the overthrow of the U. S. government by force or by unconstitutional means.

Kutcher demanded that the SWP be removed from the Attorney General's political blacklist of "subversive" organizations which provided the basis for his discharge. His complaint pointed out that the Attorney General's list was issued without notice or presentation of charges to the SWP, without any hearing or evidence, and that repeated requests by the SWP for a public hearing to refute the charges were denied.

VA Administrator Carl Gray, Attorney General J. Howard McGrath, the three members of the U. S. Civil Service Commission and the 21 members of the Loyalty Review Board of the U. S. Civil Service Commission were named as co-defendants in the court action.

The main points made in the application for the injunction were as follows:

(Continued on page 3)

Workers of the World, Unite!

# THE MILITANT

PUBLISHED WEEKLY IN THE INTERESTS OF THE WORKING PEOPLE

## Emergency Conference Of Labor Needed Now

FEB. 8 — For the eighth time since June 1947, Truman personally has invoked the hated Taft-Hartley Act against American workers. The president who before election promised repeal of this infamous law, is now using it for the third time against the coal miners.

On Feb. 6, Truman announced a "national emergency" in the eight-month coal struggle and set up a Taft-Hartley "fact-finding" board to report the "facts" to him by Monday, Feb. 13. This is preliminary to seeking a federal court injunction to force the miners to work under the operators' dictates for 80 days.

## TRUMAN AIDS OPERATORS

The soft coal miners have answered this attempt to club them back into the pits without a contract with their characteristic independence and militancy. They promptly shut down almost all bituminous mines, adding some 270,000 strikers to the 100,000 out prior to Truman's decree.

By his action, Truman has com-

plied with the demands of the "Hate-Lewis" gang who have been clamoring for the government to crush the miners with the Slave Labor Law. He has joined forces openly with the parasitic coal operators, the steel corporations which own a large part of the coal industry, the Congressional labor-baiters headed by men like Senator Taft, the Big Business press.

If the miners refuse to submit to Truman's phony "fact-finding" and to go back to work for 80 days on the operators' onerous terms, they can be enjoined by a federal court, fined monstrous sums and even jailed for "contempt." The UMW treasury was robbed of \$1,420,000 in 1948 on "contempt" charges following a Truman-invoked Taft-Hartley injunction.

Truman's strikebreaking Taft-Hartley order has incited the capitalist offensive against the miners to a ferocious intensity. The combined power of the corporations and their government is being hurled against the miners. The forces of predatory wealth are determined to "get" the miners because they are the very spearhead of militant labor in America.

## CUNNING MOVES

Step by step, Truman has cunningly laid the basis for his T-H assault on the miners. He first called for a 70-day "truce" during which the miners would return to "normal production" and submit their demands to his hand-picked "fact-finding" board. This would have given the operators a chance to pile up more coal reserves and put them in a better

## Steel Union Sends Aid to the Miners

FEB. 8 — The CIO United Steel Workers today sent a check for a half million dollars to the striking United Mine Workers "to assist the needy miners and their families in their struggle against the coal operators."

Philip Murray, the steel union's president, announced he had also called on his organization's 2,200 locals and million members to make further "substantial" contributions on their own. "The war which is being waged against their [the miners] union can be directed against your own and all other unions by the same combinations of wealth when they deem it expedient to do so," Murray said.

He made no reference to Truman's role in invoking the Taft-Hartley Law against the UMW.

position to hold out against the miners in the spring.

Within 48 hours of Truman's proposal, the operators walked out of renewed negotiations that they themselves had requested with the United Mine Workers. John L. Lewis correctly pointed out that Truman's move had stiffened the resistance of the operators and filled them "with enthusiasm over the prospect that the government may now move in through the courts or through the Taft-Hartley slave statute to do a job upon the mine workers

(Continued on page 4)

## HITLER GENERAL DRAFTS U. S. DICTATORSHIP PLAN

All the preparatory work for setting up a full-scale military dictatorship in the United States along the lines of the Prussian military system has already been completed. That is the gist of a report in the Feb. 10 U. S. News & World Report, whose editors have a pipeline to top government and brass hat circles in Washington.

On the "request of U. S. generals" none other than Heinz Guderian, chief of staff of Hitler's military machine, has prepared the "blueprint" for dictatorial powers to be lodged in a streamlined American model of the German General Staff.

It centralizes power in the hands of the Big Brass to an extent unknown even in Germany. There is to be "no civilian authority" whatever between "the military and the President as Commander in Chief."

In place of a Defense Secretary there will be a "supreme military commander" whose word is law for all the armed forces and all the departments under the jurisdiction of the projected General Staff, super Prussian model.

## COMPLETE POWERS

Under the complete control of the military would be such "branches" as the selective service, the "war production board," the "home defense office," the veterans' pension office, the "central intelligence service" and even a "joint press office."

The military would have "a freer reign" not only to allocate "defense dollars" and hold the entire "war industry," that is, the core of the country's economy, under their thumb, but also to exercise sweeping "wartime censorship" over the press and over free speech.

Under this plan the projected

Armaments Office acquires vast jurisdiction and powers. It operates the draft system and among the "functions" of this all-powerful body are: "management of the armed forces' civilian employees, [read: the vast majority of the population in wartime], real estate, research and development [read: complete control over atomic and all other scientific research]. It also takes over the work of the multi-billion dollar Veterans' Administration."

Guderian's "blueprint" is "not to be adopted now by Congress," assures the U. S. News, and then goes on to add: "It is a wartime plan, with its chances for enactment varying in direct proportion to the nearness of war."

The heart of the Prussian military system was its General Staff and the sweeping powers vested in it. So notorious was its role and power that after the first world war, the German General Staff was ordered dissolved and its reconstruction "in any form" was banned under the Versailles Treaty. The dissolution order was evaded with the tacit approval of the Allies. The German General Staff played a key role in lifting Hitler to power and then in waging the Second World War. It was again ordered "dissolved." Now the Washington Brass Hats are determined to transplant this power-house of militarism into this country. In their wildest dream the Prussian Junkers never went so far as does Gen. Guderian who quite appropriately has drafted the master-plan for the power-drunk militarists of Wall St.

# Hell-Bomb -- Road to World Suicide

By Art Prels

Truman's order to make the new Hell-Bomb affirms that Washington has no program for peace and no hope of peace. It means that American imperialism has given humanity, including the American people, the choice: Bow to Wall Street's rule or suffer annihilation!

This is not only our interpretation of Truman's decision. It is the meaning placed upon his Hell-Bomb policy by a powerful sector of American capitalists themselves, as voiced in no less authoritative a journal than Business Week.

"This is not a weapon," says the Feb. 4 Business Week. "It is a means of blackmail by suicide pact."

The American ruling class is like the man who walked into a bank, flourished a jar of colorless liquid and shouted: "Don't anyone move. This is nitro-glycerin. Hand over all the dough or I'll drop it and blow us all to bits."

Business Week's diagnosis of capitalism gone mad, contained in its editorial "The Worst Question Ever Asked," reflects the capitalists' almost hysterical fear at their own appalling decision to produce a device that has no calculable limits of destruction.

## TRUMAN'S DECISION

The editorial makes plain that implicit in the very decision to make the H-Bomb is the belief by the rulers in Washington that war is inevitable, sooner or later. Truman and his advisors did not consider the decision in terms of peace at all, but solely in terms of the "calculated risk" for America itself in using the H-Bomb.

Business Week's editors do not deduce this from anything Truman has said, but rather on the statement by atomic scientist Harold C. Urey, who "let slip a clue to the real dimensions of the decision."

Urey's "slip," says Business

Week, "revealed, in the bleak clarity of a lightning flash, the appalling dilemma before which the Atomic Energy Commission, its Scientific Advisory Board, and the President sat in fascinated paralysis for something like three months:

"Which is better — to risk losing a war or to risk making the world uninhabitable?"

As everyone knows, Washington has chosen the second "risk," or rather the virtual certainty, of universal destruction if the hydrogen bomb is used.

## ITS REAL POWER

When the news first leaked out about the H-Bomb which would have a thousand times the explosive force of the latest model uranium bomb, says Business Week, "the military writers quickly explained the cube-root law that dogs designers of ordnance — that an explosive 1,000 times more powerful is only ten times more destructive."

But "to the scientists who know what is involved, and to the few political leaders they are allowed to talk to," admits Business Week, the H-Bomb is "something else again."

By contrast to the H-Bomb, the "familiar uranium bomb" has really "comforting limitations," Business Week finds "comfort" in the fact that "one uranium bomb may destroy a city, but people have done that before; it just took a thousand bombs instead of one."

But with this new hydrogen bomb "there's no comfort in the cube-root law." Even if it can do "only" ten times the explosive damage of a "comforting" uranium bomb, each hydrogen bomb "will create as much radioactivity as a thousand uranium bombs."

"Explode a few dozen H-Bombs, a few hundred of them — and you would in an atom war — and you can conceivably so poison the

atmosphere as to leave human survival impossible."

Which leads the editors of Business Week to the horrible thought that to "win" a war with hydrogen bombs means the likelihood of wiping out the capitalists as well as the working people. Wiping out hundreds of millions of ordinary people with the "familiar" uranium bombs is a "comforting" thought. But a weapon that will immolate its own users — that, screams Business Week, "is a means of blackmail by suicide pact."

But even though it feels a "special touch of horror," Business Week finds that the decision to build H-Bombs is "unquestionably right."

Not that Business Week holds out the hope of peace even by what it calls "blackmail." For it concludes on the note of deepest pessimism: "Suddenly, and in the most coldly literal sense, the human race has turned a corner: It must learn to get along better

with itself or expect to wipe itself out sometime in the second half of the twentieth century." How to "get along better," it does not say.

Thus, the "security" which capitalism offers the world today "the security" of total obliteration. This is its only perspective. How completely Truman's decision to make the H-Bomb confirms Leon Trotsky's words, in the May 1940 Manifesto of the Fourth International, that "today it is a question of saving mankind from suicide."

Nothing will halt American imperialism from pulling the atomic trigger on the Hell-Bomb but the mass intervention of the people. As Trotsky pointed out at the start of the second world war, capitalism in its death agony will not hesitate to drag all mankind to the grave with it. And with luminous insight, he posed the alternatives for humanity: World Suicide or World Socialism.

European Notebook

Modena and Ivry

By Ernest Germain

On Monday, Jan. 9, the police of the capitalist Republic of Italy killed six young workers and wounded 60 others when they fired to disperse an unarmed crowd in the city of Modena.

On Sunday, Jan. 15, several thousand de Gaulist hoodlums suddenly invaded Ivry, a working class suburb of Paris, with the aim of terrorizing the workers. Many were injured in the sharp clashes that broke out.

These are not isolated incidents. They involve two specific stages in the general offensive of the European bourgeoisie against the working class. This offensive unfolds today on three different levels. In Italy and in France the employers are again systematically resorting to the weapon of the lockout and are preparing to smash the militancy of the workers by means of unemployment.

ordered the officers of the Celere to fire at any "menacing" crowd that approached the factories. The striking workers chose the premises of the Fonderie Riunite as the principal working class stronghold of the region and a crowd of several thousand workers and their wives tried to break through the police cordon to occupy the premises.

The Celere had their rifles ready and when the crowd came

The aim of the invasion of Ivry was to show the capitalists that the de Gaulist bands were already capable of engaging in serious battle with the hated "reds." From all indications the French capitalists do not feel as safe with the protection of the police alone as do their Italian colleagues. De Gaulle is offering them supplementary protection. Fortunately for the workers, the offer has not proved serious enough to be given consideration by the bourgeoisie.

POLICY OF LEADERS

The incidents at Modena and Ivry have aroused understandable apprehension among working class circles in Italy and France. After the Modena incident, there was a general strike — which unfortunately was not very general after months of Stalinist strike gymnastics — and the convening of a socialist-communist "Little Parliament" at the scene of the events. After the Ivry incident a big workers demonstration was held on the spot, where a fiery speech was delivered by the Stalinist leader Maurice Thorez. In both cases the reply to reaction was made by "leaders" who, by their past criminal policies, bear full responsibility for the present events. In both cases the reply was impotent because of the present policies of these same leaders.



MAURICE THOREZ

closer fired at point-blank range. Signor Scelba could be satisfied; his instructions had been faithfully executed. The Italian proletariat has new deaths to avenge!

FRENCH CONDITIONS

The circumstances that gave rise to the incidents at Ivry were quite different. The movement of Charles de Gaulle, the French bourgeoisie's candidate for Bonaparte, has been stagnating for many months. The capitalists hesitate to give it their support; they prefer, for the time being, to find less expensive expedients. American imperialism continues to turn its back on this movement; de Gaulle's demands threaten to upset once again the "European" apparatus, already badly shaken, which has been built up at so much cost by the State Department. Also, as long as the workers remained passive, de Gaulleism underwent a serious decline.

But for the last several months France like Italy has experienced a certain revival of labor struggles. The general strike of November 1949 was on the whole successful. The workers in Paris and in the provinces vigorously reacted to the attempts by the capitalists to intimidate them by the walkout. These were the favorable conditions which induced the pretender de Gaulle to offer his services to the employers.

if they now take seriously the present orders of this same Thorez, will have to confront the powerfully armed de Gaulist bands with bare hands.

All the past betrayals and capitulation of Romita and Thorez have greatly discouraged and disoriented the workers and by the same token decreased the possibilities of an effective reply by labor today. But these "leaders" turn on the workers today and accuse them of lacking militancy because they are beginning not to take so seriously all the orders of those who led them into their present fix.

LESSONS FOR U. S. WORKERS

The American workers have another lesson to draw from these events. The dollars of the taxpayers, supposedly used to satisfy the pressing needs of the European working people, have in reality served to swell the profits of the employers and to strengthen the repressive powers

of the state. Enriched by the dollars of the American workers, the employers of Europe are becoming more and more arrogant to their own workers; and if the workers try to resist starvation, they have them shot by their police, also equipped with the same American dollars.

If this policy ends in a complete working class defeat; if the European workers agree to work at starvation wages, the American employers will turn to their own workers and explain to them that in the face of the sudden competition of cheap European labor, it will be necessary for them to accept some sacrifices if they want to avert the depression and mass unemployment. For the American workers the defense of the European working class today in its struggle for a decent living standard and for trade union rights is not only a duty of international proletarian solidarity; it is a question of elementary self-defense.

COMINFORM, JAPAN CP ATTEMPT TO AVOID RIFT

The Jan. 16 Militant reported the public outbreak of a conflict between the Cominform and the leadership of the Japanese Communist Party, headed by Sanzo Nosaka.

Nosaka was sharply attacked by the official organ of the Cominform on Jan. 6 for an "opportunistic" policy he had advocated some three years earlier in January 1947. The attack was picked up by the Moscow Pravda.

Instead of making Nosaka the scapegoat and purging him (as was indicated by the concerted attack), the Political Bureau of the Japanese CP and Nosaka himself publicly recognized their "errors" and recanted. At the same time they expelled Ko Nakanishi who had zealously sprung to the defense of the Cominform.

Now comes the sequel to the episode.

The European Stalinist press promptly "aligned" itself with Nakanishi, the expelled opponent of Nosaka. Then on Jan. 17 Pravda published an article which made no mention whatever of Nosaka but denounced Nakanishi as a "provocateur." This unexpected about-face in Moscow has proved so embarrassing to the European Stalinists that up to the last week in January they made no further mention in their press to the Japanese developments.

The Feb. 7 Daily Worker reported without comment Nosaka's public recantation and cited the statement of the enlarged Plenum of the Japanese Central Committee which accepted Nosaka's

"self-criticism" as follows: "Taking into consideration the decision of Comrade Nosaka, and also giving due credit to the positive aspects of Comrade Nosaka's 20-year activity, we are confident that we shall see good, leading activity on the part of Comrade Nosaka in the future."

Apparently a behind-the-scenes compromise has been reached between Nosaka and the Cominform, that is, the Kremlin. Both sides are obviously maneuvering and fearful of an open break. The Kremlin cannot afford to have a repetition of the Yugoslav experience in the Far East and is proceeding with much greater caution. The Japanese Stalinists for their part seem anxious to remain on good terms with the Kremlin.

Stalin has contented himself for the time being with the public recantation by Nosaka and the Political Bureau of the Japanese CP. There has been no repetition of attacks against Nosaka by the Cominform.

On the other hand, Nosaka is to remain in the leadership and for the time being, at least, the incident is to be considered as closed by both sides.

The scapegoat in the entire affair turns out to be the veteran Japanese Stalinist Nakanishi, who displayed too much zeal, and jumped too quickly to the defense of his masters in the Kremlin.

French Trotskyists Hold 6th National Convention

PARIS — The PCI (French Trotskyists) held its Sixth National Convention here at Salle Lanery on Jan. 14-17. About 100 delegates participated in the free and intense discussions during the four days' sessions.

The discussion on the French political situation centered round two basic tasks: the building of a united working class front against the unfolding capitalist offensive and the forging of a new workers' leadership capable of displacing the official treacherous leaderships.

One session was devoted entirely to the theoretical analysis of the developments in the Soviet buffer countries. A special point on the agenda was the defense of Yugoslavia, a task that has been placed high on the list of PCI activities. The convention sent a special message to the Yugoslav workers, the text of which is reproduced below.

The convention also heard a report on the activity of the Fourth International since the Second World Congress.

The deliberations and work of the convention demonstrated that the French Trotskyists have successfully surmounted the crisis precipitated two years ago when the former leadership deserted the party to plunge into the RDR adventure. From an organization previously split among conflicting tendencies, a homogenous party has now emerged which has truly begun to penetrate the working class.

On departing from the convention, the delegates were filled with confidence and enthusiasm in the knowledge that the party had grown mature and cohesive enough to intervene powerfully in the unfolding crisis of French Stalinism and in the regrouping of the French revolutionary vanguard.

CONVENTION MESSAGE

The text of the message to the Yugoslav workers adopted by the convention follows:

Comrades: The Sixth National Convention of the PCI, French section of the Fourth International, sends its revolutionary greetings to the workers and peasants of the Federated People's Republic of Yugoslavia and to the Yugoslav Communist Party.

In the course of its deliberations our convention has decided to continue and intensify its activity among the French working class to rally it to the defense of the Yugoslav revolution. Our party stands without reservations alongside the Yugoslav CP in its

struggle for truth against slander, in its struggle for independence from both Wall Street and the Kremlin, in its struggle for the independence of the labor movement from the old treacherous leaderships.

Our party calls upon the French trade unions not to be deterred by the lying statements of their leaders and to accept the invitation of the Yugoslav trade unions to send delegations to the Yugoslav Republic to see with their own eyes the truth which their leaders want to keep hidden from them.

We call upon the young workers of France to organize labor brigades, demonstrating the international solidarity of the proletariat.

The PCI has decided to intensify its struggle for a new revolutionary international of the proletariat, the indispensable instrument and the sole guarantee of the defense of the Yugoslav revolution and the victory of the world revolution.

Long live the international solidarity of the working class! Long live the Yugoslav Revolution! Long live the World Revolution!

THE MILITANT ARMY

New York SWP Passes 2-3 Mark In Sub Campaign

The New York Local of the Socialist Workers Party, not quite half-way thru with its February Militant subscription campaign, has already scored 203 points, more than two-thirds of its quota of 300 points, through several Sunday mobilizations and weekday assignments to comrades.

Julie of the Brooklyn branch is high scorer with 10 points to his credit. Comrade Jane, also from Brooklyn, is to be complimented with the 6 points she scored by selling subscriptions to The Militant in the factory where she works.

Comrade Marvel Dobbs, Literature Agent in Chicago, writes that the branch has established The Militant on three newsstands, one of them among the biggest stands in the city. Ten copies of the paper were sold at each of these stands last week. If this keeps up, Marvel says that the branch will have to increase its bundle order.

Here is a report from Oakland by L. R. "Thursday night is Militant Sales night in the Oakland branch. Last Thursday we sold 20 copies at an AFL rally. This Thursday we also sold 7 copies of the paper at a UAW (Chevrolet) meeting. 13 Militants were sold at the University of California campus last Monday afternoon. Bill M. and Frank were the salesmen."

"Louise M. and William G. sold

10 Militants at our monthly sale at Local No. 6 of the Warehouse Union. We hope to keep up these sales and add to them in order to get The Militant as widely read as possible." Oakland upped its bundle order by ten copies this week.

The Detroit branch is taking advantage of every opportunity to get The Militant into the hands of the striking Chrysler workers. Last week Howard Mason, Literature Agent of the branch, ordered 1,000 copies of The Militant to be sold at the picket lines. The branch began this coverage with a distribution at the Dodge Plant picket line. Sales were also held at a Chrysler membership meeting, a General Motors conference, a Dodge Stewards meeting, at Budd Local 306 and at the NAACP branch. The Detroit branch is really "on the beam." Not a week goes by without word from Howard about bigger and better sales.

After our column was written last week Harry Braverman of the Youngstown branch sent in an order for 100 extra copies of the miners issue for mailing to local unionists. The reports of the sales of this issue have also begun to arrive with Pittsburgh and Philadelphia reporting great success.

From the Pittsburgh branch Freddie Forrest writes in an enthusiastic vein. "The branch has just returned from a day's 'outing' in the Western Pennsylvania mining regions in high spirits entirely due to the militancy, aggressiveness and high political level of the striking miners who warmly received the miners issue of The Militant. Coverdale, Lawrence, Library, Brownsville, Alpenport, Coal Center, Daisytown were visited by two groups of comrades. . . Believe me, there is no greater thrill than to see a bunch of miners congregating around their union hall, and reading The Militant."

Harold of Philadelphia reports that 6 comrades went into the anthracite coal region of Pennsylvania and distributed all of the 1,000 copies of The Militant they had ordered. The towns of Tamaqua, Lansford, Hazleton and Nanticoke were visited. One miner in Lansford was overheard discussing The Militant on the street with another miner. "Gosh! This is great! I never knew we had friends on the outside."

Detroit

"Two Americas"

A 15 minute recorded speech by JAMES P. CANNON National Sec'y of the SWP —Plus—

A dramatic documentary film of the historic events of the Russian Revolution.

Sat., Feb. 18 8 PM

6108 Linwood

Donation 60c

Newark

V. R. Dunne

will speak on Labor and Civil Rights

Friday, February 17 8:30 PM

—at—

423 Springfield Avenue —admission free—

BUY NOW

Stalinism and the Labor Movement:

- 1. Leon Trotsky: Stalinism and Bolshevism 32 pp. 15c
2. James P. Cannon: American Stalinism and Anti-Stalinism The End of the Comintern 48 pp. 15c 36 pp. 10c
3. Art Preis: Stalinists on the Waterfront 32 pp. 10c

Order from Pioneer Publishers 116 UNIVERSITY PLACE, NEW YORK 3, N. Y.

"THAT LITTLE PAPER"



"We'll never forget the way that little paper defended us during the war when everyone else was against us." That's what one of the district officials of the United Mine Workers said recently about The Militant.

Behind these simple, affectionate words there's a big story. The miners took the lead during the war in labor's struggle for decent wages and conditions. They were hounded and persecuted by the big corporations and their government agents. The entire reactionary press from The Wall Street Journal to the Stalinist Daily Worker screamed at the striking miners. Only The Militant backed them up 100% in their progressive actions.

Like the miners on the economic front, the Trotskyist movement took the lead on labor's political front during the war. The Militant, as the weekly paper of the American Trotskyists, opposed the imperialist war and called for a socialist world of enduring peace, boundless plenty and the brotherhood of man.

The evil forces that attacked the miners also raised their clubs against the Trotskyists. Eighteen of our leaders were railroaded to federal prison during the war as the first victims of the infamous Smith "Gag" Act. The second-class mailing rights of The Militant were threatened. Harsh blows fell on us from all sides. But the cause of socialism is the kind that builds courage and stout hearts. Like the miners we did not give in.

Today The Militant is America's leading socialist weekly, the most respected and authoritative voice in the radical political wing of the labor movement. It has earned its solid reputation for telling the truth no matter what the consequences.

If you are interested in getting the facts under the surface of events, if you want to know the real score in politics, economics, foreign affairs and all the dynamic social struggles of our time, you need The Militant. And if you enjoy a paper that knows how to fight on the political front in the most effective way against Big Business and its agents, you'll wonder how you ever got along without this "little paper."

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

Name .....

Street .....

City .....

State .....

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

Atomic Energy and Capitalist Society

By Arne Swabeck

The Atomic Energy Act of 1946 set up the civilian Atomic Energy Commission which is now supposedly in charge of policy and management of the far-flung activities of a vast technological realm — the atomic industry — representing a capital investment of more than five billion dollars. This investment has been made in its entirety by the United States government. It foots all the bills. "And," says Fortune magazine, "no major company in any industry in the U. S. has so far made a private capital investment of one penny in the atom."

Still the question arises: whose atom is it?

WHO RUNS IT?

In its majority composition, a list of the personnel of policy-making bodies, from the first atomic commission appointed by Secretary of War Stimson in 1945, through the AEC itself and its various advisory committees, would read like a roll call of J. P. Morgan subsidiary executives with a generous sprinkling of officials from the Rockefeller oil monopoly, the Mellon aluminum and electrical machinery interests as well as the Du Pont chemical trust. The latter earned the well-deserved title, after World War I of "merchants of death." Moreover, Big Business corporations and some Big Business-controlled universities run practically all of the atomic industry's plants, reactors, laboratories and institutions of basic research, which are farmed out by the AEC as "contractor operations."

Union Carbide and Carbon Corporation, which is financially interested in mining of atomic raw materials, is the prime contractor for the works at Oak Ridge. Last year it received a straight fee of about \$1,900,000, or a 3.2% return on a \$60 million contract. This of course is entirely aside from profits made on raw materials and supplies furnished.

General Electric, a part of the Morgan combine, runs the Hanford plutonium works. Last year its allotment from the AEC totalled about \$208 million. The

General Electric four-year contract provides for \$1 of "profit" for its duration. In it, however, there is an innocent-looking item for "overhead" amounting to \$2,450,000 each year.

Let anyone believe that this Morgan concern carries on its work merely for such a "modest" return, we hasten to add that the AEC's contract with General Electric covered also the Knolls laboratories, near Schenectady, N. Y., and the experimental power pile, near West Milton, N. Y. Both are being built for GE with government funds, the former at a cost of \$25 million, the latter at a cost of \$20 million.

A rich uncle always has a relaxing effect on even the most sturdy nephew. He is not too scrupulous about the uncle's money. And so, aside from the benefits already mentioned, profits made from supplies furnished, etc., General Electric taps the "uncle" for operating expenses out of which it gains for its own use the results of experimentation and research. It is able to train and develop its personnel at government expense. All the while General Electric, like Union Carbide, is not risking a penny of its own capital on the atom. Still it is said that the words "patriotism" and "sense of duty" constantly occur in its officials' conversation on the atom; but the word "profit" never occurs.

FOR WHAT PURPOSE?

This, however, is only one side of the question. This is speaking only in terms of immediate revenue. For monopoly capitalism the long term perspectives of developing and utilizing atomic energy are of far greater importance. And so the question of whose atom it is, immediately poses another: for what purpose is it to be utilized?

All scientific authorities agree that there are many ways by which the heat produced by nuclear fission in a chain reacting atomic pile can be used to drive steam or gas turbines for the generation of electricity. Basically the problem is the well known one of converting heat into mechanical energy which is within

the scope of everyday engineering.

As far back as March 1946 the Lillenthal Board, in its report on international control of atomic energy, stated that operating units for atomic power, "can be in existence within a few years, and that only the gradual incorporation and adaptation of such units to the specific demands of contemporary economy will involve a protracted development." With respect to the problems of raw materials the report added: "We see no significant limitations on this development, either in the availability or in the cost of the fundamental active materials. . . Nor can there be much question that ways will be found to cheapen and simplify the processes involved in the production of the fissionable materials themselves."

PRESENT POSSIBILITIES

Professor Arthur H. Compton, a Nobel Prize Winner, stated about the same time that "if there were sufficient demand for a demonstration, a reasonably efficient plant using super-heated steam for driving a turbine could be put into operation within a year."

In September 1946 an Oak Ridge group of scientists and engineers completed a special study which said: "On the basis of this study, and other similar studies which have been made recently, it seems probable that nuclear power will find favorable industrial application if obstacles are not placed in the path of its development."

Subsequent discoveries verify the validity of these statements. There are ample indications that ways are being found to cheapen and simplify the processes involved in the production of fissionable materials. One such indication is the development of an experimental "breeder reactor" recently announced by the AEC. It is expected that in its furnace this "breeder reactor" will create more plutonium — by transforming uranium-238 — than it consumes in keeping aglow. In other words, one atom of uranium-235 would produce more than one atom of plutonium. Already a couple of years ago

a new and extremely economical energy process fueled by thorium was indicated. It grew out of successful experiments at the Los Alamos laboratory with a new kind of atomic pile, based on the fission of plutonium by high energy, or high speed neutrons (about a million electron volts).

Thorium is estimated to be three times as abundant as uranium; and it has been known for some time that thorium-232 undergoes fission when bombarded with such high speed neutrons. Thorium resembles uranium and it appears to possess the requirements for a sustained and controlled chain reaction. Hence the fast neutron fission of thorium should prove simpler and much less costly than the more complex problem involved in the creation of plutonium. It would eliminate the expensive, highly purified, great graphite structure which is now used as the moderator to slow down the neutrons at the Hanford atomic pile where plutonium is made.

Doubts are no longer entertained among scientists that prospects for atomic power improvements are virtually unlimited.

WHAT OBSTACLES?

Thus the magic formula, atomic energy for power to drive the wheels of industry, seemed about ready to be transformed into the reality of life. Then what happened? Obviously obstacles were placed in the path of its development.

To mention only one example. It is known that a project for a large experimental atomic-power plant, which would have generated through nuclear fission heat of 650 and 940 degrees Fahrenheit of heat energy for transfer to a conventional steam plant by means of a "heat exchanger," to be constructed at Oak Ridge, had passed the designing stage. This project was abandoned by the AEC.

The truth is that monopoly capitalism, which in reality controls the policy and management of the atomic energy program at all levels, resists the development of this new source of power for socially useful purposes. Un-

Subscriptions: \$2 per year; \$1 for 6 months. Foreign: \$3.50 per yr; \$2 for 6 mos.

THE MILITANT

Published Weekly in the interests of the Working People THE MILITANT PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION 116 University Pl., N. Y. 3, N. Y. (Phone: AL 4-9590)

Bundle Orders (5 or more copies): 50 each in U.S., 40 each in foreign countries. Signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent The Militant's policies.

Vol. XIV - No. 7

Monday, February 13, 1950



TROTSKY

"While the magnates of monopoly capitalism stand above the official organs of state power, controlling them from their heights, the opportunist trade union leaders scurry around the footstools of state power, creating support for it among the working masses. It is impossible to perform this filthy chore so long as workers' democracy within the trade unions is maintained. The regime in the unions, following the pattern of the regime of the bourgeois states, is becoming more and more authoritarian. In war time the trade union bureaucracy definitely becomes the military police of the Army's General Staff in the working class."

—Leon Trotsky, Manifesto of the Fourth International, 1940.



LENIN

Key Problems in Study of Negro History

By J. Meyer

The writers and organizers of the study of Negro history have reached a critical stage in their work. They have accumulated an imposing body of facts which demonstrate the active participation of Negroes in the making of American history and, in particular, in the creation of the American liberal and revolutionary tradition. It is today impossible to write a serious history of the Civil War period without taking into consideration the research which has gone into the making of the Journal of Negro History.

had to say about these and what Lenin and Trotsky had to say about the Russian Revolution, they will find that the role of the Negro masses and Negro political leaders will begin to fall into well-defined political patterns. They will have to tackle the Stalinist corruption at its source. They will have to study Trotsky's History of the Russian Revolution and, side by side with it, the versions of the Stalinist historians. They will have to study Stalinist accounts of the rise of Stalinism and Trotsky's Stalin. They will have to study and to decide.

ROLE OF THE MASSES

The same thing has happened in regard to the Puritan revolution in Britain. The Levellers, and men like John Lilburne, from being mere footnotes to history, have become the center of important studies, in both England and America; the historical dominance of men like Oliver Cromwell has been seriously challenged, and here, as in France, the role of the masses is the center of attention.

In Russia the same problem has taken an entirely opposite turn. Stalin and the Kremlin oppressors of the people have rewritten the history of the Russian revolution, excluded the role of Trotsky and all who opposed their bureaucratic oppression of the people, and through their Communist parties have spent millions in trying to impose upon the people of the world a version of the Russian revolution which makes the whole mighty development the result of the wisdom, foresight, energy and courage of Stalin. Among the many reasons why they hate Trotskyism so bitterly is that it has exposed these falsifications at every opportunity.

After the election of 1890, Lincoln and the bourgeoisie took over. But until that time, Douglass as the slave who escaped, as the brilliant lieutenant of Garrison and Phillips, and then as the man who broke with them to urge political action, without giving up his principles as a radical abolitionist — Douglass is the most symbolic figure of the pre-Civil War period. Yet after all the work the Negro historians have done on him, his significance, both as an American and as an American Negro, eludes them.

ROLE OF DOUGLASS

It is not hard to understand why this theoretical battle over the role played by the masses in past great revolutions assumes such importance. Not merely because of the past, but because one of the problems in the contemporary world is: Can the people, the workers, the peasants, the lower middle class, use their immense power to reorganize a collapsing society and at the same time not fall under the grip of totalitarianism?

WHY IT IS IMPORTANT

The Negro historians have not as a whole faced this question. They first sought to rely on the facts alone. Where they'd begin to study historical method, they fell under the influence of the Stalinists. But all Stalinist history, following the great example of their masters in Russia, pays lip-service to the role of the masses while in reality sparing no pains to exalt the ideas of submission, discipline, authority. They do not point out the importance of leaders as men who have worked with the masses for years, as men whom the masses know and trust, as men whose every step is conditioned by recognition of the fact that they represent the deepest instincts and desires of the mass. Not at all. The conception they seek to inculcate is the conception of authority, the kind of authority the dictators of the Kremlin wield. The kind of authority that the CP leaderships seek to establish over the working class movement in every country.

THE SAME PROBLEM

Their dilemma is not at all a Negro one. It affects the writing of history from one end of the world to another, and nowhere more sharply than in the history of revolutionary periods such as the English Civil War of the 17th century, the French revolution of the 18th century and the Russian revolution of this century. All these great historical events are in process of re-evaluation, like the Civil War in the U. S., with regard to the same problem.

THE NEXT STEP

What then is the way out? The Negro writers have to pose and grapple with the general historical question: What is the role of the masses in great revolutionary upheavals? They will find that instead of dealing, as they have been doing, with the Negro role in U. S. history, they are dealing with a world-wide problem of historical writing which is engaging the attention of serious historians today as never before.

Once they have grappled with what modern writers are saying about the role of the mass movements in the English and French Revolutions, once they master directly what Marx and Engels

had to say about these and what Lenin and Trotsky had to say about the Russian Revolution, they will find that the role of the Negro masses and Negro political leaders will begin to fall into well-defined political patterns. They will have to tackle the Stalinist corruption at its source. They will have to study Trotsky's History of the Russian Revolution and, side by side with it, the versions of the Stalinist historians. They will have to study Stalinist accounts of the rise of Stalinism and Trotsky's Stalin. They will have to study and to decide.

Then they will continue to do as they are doing now, accumulate material but be unable to make use of it; not only that, they will not be able to hold even the positions they have now. Already liberal historians like Nevins are backing a counter-attack with attempts to show that the Civil War was not fought over slavery as an economic system but was a moral question. The Stalinist Aptheker now proposes to show that it was the poor whites in the South who initiated the struggle for freedom from slavery.

The Negro writers on Negro history therefore have to make a big step forward. But having made it they will find that they will add great contributions not only to American history but to world history. Their work will be drawn into what is already movement on a world scale. They will begin to reap the full fruits of their patient, pioneering work.

They will also find that if they do this work as it ought to be done they will be led to the solution not merely of historical problems but of the burning political questions of the day — the future of the U. S. as well as of the Negro people. For history is a part of the class struggle.

In their determination to right the wrongs done to Negroes, the writers of Negro history have done much to clear away the jungle of lies and falsehoods which obscured American history wherever it approached Negroes. Now the time has come to link that work deliberately, and consciously with the most progressive historical currents of the day. A heavy price will inevitably be paid if this is not done.

Kutcher Appeals In Washington

(Continued from page 1) statutory authority for their promulgation.

The complaint states that government representatives admitted Kutcher's position gave him no access to any confidential or classified information which might threaten the security of the United States. Under the "loyalty" procedures the case against Kutcher consisted entirely of secret information and FBI reports which were not disclosed to the plaintiff. At the hearing, no witness testified nor was any evidence introduced against him of wrongdoing. Kutcher had no right to subpoena, confront or cross-examine witnesses or rebut their secret charges. None of the hearings were public.

George Novack, national secretary of the Kutcher Civil Rights Committee which is directing the veteran's defense, said: "The discharge of this legless veteran solely because of his political beliefs raises issues of democratic liberties and job rights which go beyond the discrimination against Kutcher and his party, important as they are in themselves. Through this major court test we hope to obtain a clear and conclusive judgment on the violations of constitutional rights and proper legal procedures involved in the 'loyalty' program. We intend to carry the case to the U. S. Supreme Court, if necessary."

The Bureaucratic Mentality

Louis Stark, the well-known labor correspondent of the N. Y. Times, sheds some light on the motives behind the AFL Executive Council's refusal to lend legal aid to the United Mine Workers against an impending Taft-Hartley injunction.

In the Feb. 3 Times, Stark reported that the AFL high moguls had refused to act on the word sent indirectly by John L. Lewis to the Council that he "would be pleased" if the AFL offered to join in the legal defense against the injunction proceedings brought by NLRB General Counsel Denham. CIO President Philip Murray had already made such an offer for his organization.

While the AFL officials gave no formal statement on their reasons for refusing legal aid, Stark learned that the members of the Council had engaged in considerable discussion on the question. All sorts of pretexts were raised by the Council members why they should not back the miners even to the limited extent of legal support.

But among the reasons given, there is one in particular that is most revealing of the mentality, methods and aims of the AFL bureaucracy. During the Council's discussion, reports Stark, emphasis was placed on the miners' "able and will-

ing" clause, which the coal operators have refused to renew because they claim it gives the union full authority over coal production.

"The council members saw this clause in another light," Stark discloses. "It was said that the disciplinary authority of an international union over its affiliates would be completely nullified if local unions succeeded in writing 'able and willing' clauses in their contracts."

These AFL officials, ever alert to possible direct or indirect threats to their bureaucratic authority, read into the clause that the miners shall work only when they are "able and willing" a possible concession to rank and file control of the unions. To union bureaucrats, that is a greater "danger" than a Taft-Hartley Law.

Rather than appear to give even a breath of support to anything that might seem to weaken control from the top, the AFL leaders prefer to deny aid to the miners and to give tacit support to Denham and the coal operators who claim the "able and willing" clause is "illegal" under the Taft-Hartley Act. To these bureaucrats, the "main danger" is always union democracy, that is, control of the unions by their members.

Kutcher Case in the Courts

Since Truman instituted the "loyalty" program in March 1947, protests have been multiplying against this American imitation of totalitarian thought-control practices. Outstanding authorities on civil liberties, including eminent jurists, have condemned the provisions and procedures of the purge as unconstitutional, undemocratic and unprecedented in America.

Now with the filing of James Kutcher's suit for reinstatement at Washington this week, the federal courts are being called upon for their opinion. Kutcher's petition clearly poses the basic issues. Do public workers have the same right to their political ideas and activities as other citizens, or can they be persecuted and victimized for their beliefs? Have Truman and his Attorney General the power to proscribe working class parties and other organizations by decree and penalize their members, despite the Bill of Rights and our democratic traditions?

Kutcher has had the benefit of exceptionally qualified counsel in preparing his appeal and it is the most cogent and rounded indictment of the "loyalty" purge submitted to the courts.

Experience has shown that the Federal Courts are far from being impartial dispensers of justice or protectors of the Bill of Rights, especially where important in-

terests and policies of the capitalist rulers are involved. Federal judges are political appointees responsive to the will of the Washington witch-hunters. Circuit Court decisions pertaining to the purge up to now have affirmed its legality.

However, the courts are not impervious to counterpressure from the people or totally heedless of their protests. In addition to purely legal considerations and arguments, they often take into account the state of mass sentiment in arriving at their decisions.

That is one reason, among others, why the nation-wide movement behind the Kutcher case is so crucial. The support already developed around his defense is sizeable and impressive. But the greater the forces mobilized on his behalf, the more seriously will his appeal be considered.

The case of the Legless Veteran has rightfully become the rallying center for the expanding opposition to thought-control. The campaign conducted by the Kutcher Civil Rights Committee has awakened and aroused people all over the country to the perils of the "loyalty" purge. These form the vanguard of millions more who can — and must — be enlisted in this historic struggle for civil rights and carry it forward to a successful conclusion.

What McMahon Admits

(Continued from Page 1)

McMahon proposes to counteract this "misunderstanding" by means of a 50 billion dollar "peace crusade," that is, by a temporary deal with Stalin in the course of which the "peace-loving reputation" of American imperialists might possibly be refurbished. Apparently one group of capitalist politicians in Washington is again playing with the idea of offering the Kremlin a deal, if only for the demagogic propaganda value of such a move.

But even this is not taken seriously among top capitalist circles. The editors of N. Y. Times see "small danger" of McMahon's proposal "being adopted." McMahon himself agrees that his plan might be considered as "impractical or theoretical" and sees its chief value in this that no one has anything "better" to offer and that his plan, if it proves nothing else, will at least prove "the profundity of our desire for peace."

When a capitalist politician like McMahon swears he loves peace and freedom, after having underwritten all the previous war plans of the militarists including the decision to build the Hell Bomb, only a simoleon or a rascal would take him at his word. But there can be no doubt that the mass of the American people do profoundly desire peace and are determined to preserve their democratic rights.

How much longer can they permit the critical decisions affecting their lives and liberties to be by default, or more correctly, to be blotted out, behind their backs and without their say-so? On the eve of the last war there was a powerful popular sentiment, which found its expression even in halls of Congress, that the warring powers must be taken out of the hands of the President and Congress and the people themselves must decide the question of whether we shall have peace or war.

There is an even more powerful anti-war sentiment today. But not a whisper of it is permitted in Congress. If articulated and organized, this mass sentiment can play a great role in the struggle against capitalist war. That is why it is above all the duty of organized labor in this country to rally behind the slogan: Let the people vote on the over-riding issue of peace or war!

Visit your local headquarters of the SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY. AKRON—For information, write P.O. Box 1342. BOSTON—Workers' Educational Center, 10 Stuart St., open Wed. 5:30-9:00 p.m., social last Sat. of month. BUFFALO—Militant Forum, 629 Main St., 2nd fl. Phone Madison 5900. Every afternoon except Sun. CHICAGO—169 W. Washington Street, Rm. 312-314. Tel. Dearborn 2-4767. CLEVELAND—Every Sunday, 9 p.m. at Radio Hall, 1449 E. 22nd St. (off Wade Pl. Ave.) Liberty 5608. DETROIT—6108 Linwood Ave., Phone TY 7-2227, Mon. through Sat., 12-5 p.m. FLINT—Socialist Workers Party Hall, 215 East Ninth Street, Phone: 2-2496. Open House Saturday evenings. LOS ANGELES—Militant Pub. Assn., Room 325, 124 W. 6th St. Phone Vandike 8911. LYNN (Mass.)—Militant Pub. Assn., 44 Central Ave., office open Tues., Wed. 7:30-9:30 p.m. BUFFALO—171 N. 3rd St., 2nd fl. Sun. through Fri., 7:30-9:30 p.m. Phone Hopkins 2-5337. MINNEAPOLIS—10 So. 4th St. Phone Main 7781. Daily except Sun., 10 a.m.-8 p.m. Library, bookstore. NEW YORK—For information write P.O. Box No. 1019. NEWARK—428 Springfield Ave. Phone Bigelow 2-2774. Reading Sat., 12-5 p.m. BARKLEY—108 W. 110 St., Rm. 22. Phone MO 2-1895. Open discussion Thurs., 8 p.m.

DID ROOSEVELT "APPEASE" STALIN?

By George Breitman

A favorite theme of many reactionaries (like William C. Bullitt) and of the Social Democrats (the New Leader especially, but also the Call) is that Roosevelt, by "appeasing" Stalin at the Yalta Conference in February 1945, sacrificed important "American interests" and was responsible for Washington's subsequent difficulties in the cold war. Things would be different today, they say, if Roosevelt had not been sick or badly advised; if he had not placed so much reliance on personal diplomacy; if he had really understood that the Russians cannot be trusted; if only he had stood firm and refused to make any concessions! The lesson they draw is that there must be no more "appeasement" and no relaxation of the get-tough policy.

The Stalinists, on the other hand, never have anything but praise for the Roosevelt policy at Yalta. Things would indeed be different today, they shout, if only Roosevelt had lived and been able to continue his "friendly" policy toward the Soviet Union, which Truman foully betrayed and abandoned. The lesson they draw is that the Roosevelt policy must be revived by the election of "peace-loving" men like Henry Wallace.

Both these myths are thoroughly exploded in the book completed by Edward R. Stettinius just before his death (ROOSEVELT AND THE RUSSIANS: The Yalta Conference, Doubleday and Co., 1949, 367 pp., \$4). Stettinius, a prominent capitalist, Secretary of State and a participant at Yalta, in his book gives an informative account of the demands, counter-demands and bargains struck by Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin at the first conference where they "reached fundamental agreements on postwar problems as distinct from mere statements of aims and purposes."

It is his contention that "The record of the conference shows clearly that the Soviet Union made greater concessions at Yalta to the United States and Great Britain than were made to the Soviets." The evidence he presents fully supports this contention.

Poland, one of the main points on the Yalta agenda, is a good example. Stalin had set up a puppet government in Lublin which he wanted recognized. Roosevelt and Churchill refused to do so, and insisted on an agreement to establish a new government of "national unity" which would include both the London and Lublin Poles and would hold free elections leading to a democratic regime. The final decision was substantially in line with the Roosevelt-Churchill demands.

Concessions on the Polish Question

Since then Roosevelt's critics complain that he was "taken in," because while the Lublin regime was broadened to include such London representatives as Mikolajczyk, the elections that took place were not free and eventually the London Poles were driven out of the country. But these critics overlook a vital fact: At Yalta Stalin already had complete control of Poland. As Stettinius puts it, "What did the Soviet Union [at the conference] gain in eastern Europe which she did not already have as the result of the smashing victories of the Red Army?" The answer is: Nothing. " . . . If we had made no agreements at Yalta, the Russians still would have been in full possession of the territory in Europe that President Roosevelt is alleged to have given them." Stalin had the power to set up a completely Stalinist regime in Poland instead of a People's Front government, and his allies could not have stopped him.

But, the critics continue, if Roosevelt and Churchill had refused to go along on the Polish agreement which Stalin later refused to honor, then the U. S. and British governments would have been in a better moral and propagandistic position for the cold war with the USSR. What good were the agreements in this sense?

Plenty good, Stettinius replies in the final lines of his book: "Until agreements were made and [the good faith of the Soviet Union] tested, the world could not clearly know of the difficulties of securing Russian compliance with agreements. The Western nations could not follow their present policy toward the Soviet Union unless they had behind them the record of President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill in their joint effort to deal with the Russian leaders in an honest and honorable manner at Yalta."

In other words, such agreements were very important weapons for the imperialists. "President Roosevelt did not 'surrender' anything significant at Yalta which it was within his power to withhold." But he got an agreement that Stalin broke. This helped to create the atmosphere in which it became relatively easy for the U. S. and British governments to put over their present get-tough policy toward the USSR. Here is an enlightening example: On the second day of the conference, Stalin asked Roosevelt how long he thought the U. S. would be willing to keep occupation forces in Germany. Roosevelt answered: "I can get the people and Congress to cooperate fully for peace but not to keep an army in Europe for a long time. Two years would be the limit."

Stettinius comments as follows: "Although this may now sound astonishing, it must be remembered that there was already a ground swell of public opinion demanding that our forces be returned home as soon as the war was over. Furthermore, it is reasonable to assume that, had Russian-American relations remained at the high-water mark reached at Yalta, public opinion would not have favored American troops being stationed in Europe for too long a time after the close of the war. It was the deterioration in Soviet-American relations after Yalta that rapidly changed American opinion on this question." And nothing helped the imperialists in Washington more in getting away with their present occupation and war preparation policies than the easily-proved charge that Stalin was not honoring agreements such as the one on Poland.

A "Diplomatic Triumph" for the Imperialists

On this ground alone, it appears Stettinius is correct in his estimate that the Yalta agreements were, "on the whole, a diplomatic triumph" for Roosevelt and Churchill. But there are many other grounds as well. One of Roosevelt's major aims at the conference was to get Stalin to accept a number of propositions that would remove obstacles to the establishment of the United Nations. Roosevelt got what he sought, in return for virtually meaningless concessions such as three votes for the USSR in the UN, and thus laid the ground for the formation of the organization which has proved such an effective propaganda weapon against the USSR.

Another of Roosevelt's objectives at Yalta was to get Stalin to agree to enter the Japanese war within three months after the European war ended. (At that time it was not known if the atomic bomb would work and in government circles "there was the fear that heavy casualties in Japan or the possible lack of continuous victories would have an unfortunate effect on the attitude of the American people.")

Stalin consented if in return he would get certain territorial concessions in the Far East, which Roosevelt and Churchill agreed to and for which they have been criticized. But in the first place, as Stettinius asks: "What . . . with the possible exception of the Kuriles, did the Soviet Union receive at Yalta which she might not have taken without any agreement? If there had been no agreement, the Soviet Union could have swept into North China, and the United States and the Chinese would have been in no real position to prevent it." In the second place, as Stettinius does not say, Stalin's agreement to declare war against Japan in return for territory discredits the Soviet Union in the eyes of the workers of the world and thereby undermines the mass support without which the Soviet Union will be destroyed in the next war.

The reactionaries and Social Democrats lie when they say Roosevelt failed to protect imperialist interests to the best of his ability at Yalta, just as the Stalinists lie when they say Roosevelt was really a friend of the Soviet Union who might have followed a policy different from the one pursued by his successor. Roosevelt remained loyal to his class; it was Stalin and the Stalinists who betrayed the interests of the class they claim to represent, and it is that disloyalty above all which the capitalists can thank for permitting their system to be preserved in most of the world.

## Their Kind of 'Socialist'

By Fred Hart

They threw a testimonial luncheon for Norman Thomas at the Commodore Hotel ballroom in New York City the other day. The leader of the Socialist Party attracted a goodly crowd at \$5 a plate. It was a fitting tribute to Norman Thomas' brand of "socialism." You couldn't toss a pie anywhere in that ballroom and not hit some reactionary capitalist politician, anti-socialist propagandist or malefactor of great wealth. They all had praise for Thomas, he's the kind of "socialist" they like. They meant it too.

That pride of Tammany Hall and two-time campaign manager for Franklin D. Roosevelt, James A. Farley, paid warm personal tribute to the man who once campaigned on the slogan, "Socialism in our time," but since has complained that even the Republicans have swiped some of his pet reforms.

Farley said of Thomas, "We would be better off with many more Americans like him." The old Democratic boss wasn't lying either, not from his standpoint. By "we," he meant the capitalist class and he was just saying that if there were more "socialists" like Thomas there would be less reason for the capitalists to worry about socialism.

One of the sincerest tributes came from an old-time Wall Street promoter who has twice shown American Big Business how to ante a first-class world war into super-billions of profits. Bernard Baruch, that "elder statesman" of American capitalism and "master strategist" of imperialist war planning, proclaimed his "very high regard for the integrity and courage of Mr. Thomas."

No doubt, Mr. Thomas was deeply touched by this tribute to that "integrity" and "courage"

which has just led to his proposal that his party abandon independent electoral activity and confine itself to acting as an adjunct of the corrupt Democratic machine.

The sponsors and soup-lappers at the Thomas luncheon were as choice a collection of "free enterprisers" as you'll find anywhere outside an NAM convention. There were H.V. Kaltenborn, Republican Senator Wayne Morse and William Langer, and even a spokesman for the strike-bound Chrysler Corp., its vice president and general counsel, Nicholas Kelley. He sort of made the gathering complete.

And the labor fakery and bureaucrats — how they "love that man." David Dubinsky, of course, paid his respects. And even Daniel J. Tobin, head of the AFL Teamsters, found Thomas nothing less than "a gentleman, a scholar and a great American in every sense of the word." Six years ago, Tobin's magazine had said Thomas "viewed the world through the same blood-smeared glasses as Hitler." Tobin was sued and apologized and now he's ready to admit that Thomas is the kind of "socialist" the pro-capitalists don't mind at all having around.

They say you can tell a man by the company he keeps. You can also tell a man's politics by those who praise him. In both senses, Thomas has affirmed Trotsky's appraisal of him, that he has always called himself a "socialist" as a result of a "misunderstanding."

Could you imagine "a Collection of Anti-Collectivists," as the N. Y. World-Telegram called the crew at Thomas' luncheon, paying such tribute to, say, a Eugene Debs? Can you imagine Eugene Debs even sitting in such company?

## That Speech of Carey's

By Joseph Keller

The current CIO News, dated Feb. 6, contains not a word on the recent American Legion-sponsored, Hearst-promoted conference in New York to form a "united front against Communism." This silence is particularly noticeable because top CIO leaders, along with AFL and Railroad Brotherhood spokesmen, participated in and gave a "labor" cover to this "All-American Conference" run by rabid, fascist-minded enemies of organized labor.

Indeed, the capitalist press gave special prominence to the role of CIO Secretary James Carey and his assistant, Harry Read, at the conference. Read accepted the post of chairman of a continuations committee to set up a "permanent, pro-American, anti-Communist" organization. Carey told the assembled reactionaries, "In the last war we joined with the Communists to fight the Fascists; in another war we will join the Fascists to fight the Communists."

Naturally, there has been widespread revulsion in union ranks at the spectacle of labor officials like Carey and Read joining forces with elements like Senator Mundt, William Randolph Hearst Jr., State Senator Tenney of California, George Sokolsky, the Chamber of Commerce, National Association of Manufacturers and Merwin K. Hart's anti-Semitic, pro-fascist National Economics Council.

Progressive unionists want to know if Murray, Reuther and other CIO leaders knew and approved of Carey's and Read's participation, in the name of the CIO, in this gathering of the very elements who will constitute any substantial fas-

cist movement in America. So far these CIO leaders have not let out a peep on the subject. The N. Y. Daily Compass of Feb. 2 quotes a "CIO spokesman" to the effect that "Carey's support of the Legion offshoot was no less official than CIO president Philip Murray's participation in the March of Dimes campaign." Murray has not denied this.

The CIO News does indicate, however, that the CIO leaders are trying to ward off the protests that are arising against the consorting of CIO officials with anti-labor and fascist elements. They run an editorial, "Hate Peddlers Are Busy Again," attacking the idea that "we can afford to ignore the fascist-minded groups and concentrate all our efforts on the Communists." But they say nothing about Carey and Read, joining with these same "fascist-minded groups" at the Legion-Hearst "united front against Communism."

Nor can this be taken as a rejection of Carey's statement that they "will join with the Fascists against the Communists." One CIO national vice-president, Frank Rosenblum, general secretary of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, has since said that "no right thinking labor man can support such a view." But the CIO officially has not repudiated it.

For Carey spoke what is really in their minds. They howled when the Stalinist bureaucracy made its compact with the Nazis in 1939. But the American union bureaucrats themselves are ready to make a compact with fascists, outside and inside America, when the U. S. State Department requires it.

## Unions Must Aid Miners

(Continued from page 1)

which the operators themselves have failed to do. . .

These operators hastened to inform Truman that they were eager to "cooperate fully" with his board. They were mindful of how the steel board had called for a wage-freeze and pensions far below what the miners now get and had attacked industry-wide bargaining.

### LEWIS ANSWERS

Lewis answered Truman's tricky proposal in uncompromising terms. For eight months, he wrote Truman, "the operators have gloried in the protection given them by an oppressive federal statute . . . they have boasted that the abomination, known as the Taft-Hartley Act, rendered it unnecessary to concede anything, and that in the end your high office, wielding Taft's club, would beat the mine-workers into submission."

As for Truman's board, Lewis said, the miners "do not wish

three strangers, however, well-intentioned but necessarily ill-informed, to fix their wages, decree their working conditions, define their living standards and limit the educational opportunities of their children." The miners believe, he added, that "they have an inherent right to pass upon these vital considerations themselves, and that no stranger, however situated, should be given such power over their lives."

Lewis charged that "to use the power of the state to drive men into the mines and for the profit of private employers, is involuntary servitude, violative of the spirit, and perhaps the literal text of the Thirteenth Amendment." He advised Truman that "it is questionable whether one could postulate that such mass coercion would ensure enthusiastic service from grateful men." In short, the miners would resist forced labor.

But Truman has now swung this weapon of "mass coercion"

against the miners. And he will go to the same lengths to beat down any other union which dares to fight militantly for its rights.

### WHAT WILL UNIONS DO?

The decisive question in this crucial struggle against the Taft-Hartley Law and government strikebreaking is: What will the AFL and CIO unions do? Will they now mobilize all their resources to back the miners?

The AFL Executive Council has refused even legal aid to the miners, while AFL President William Green has piously opined that "no good results" came from the past use of Taft-Hartley against the miners and "it remains to be seen" what "good" will come of it now.

CIO President Philip Murray, who had previously offered only legal aid, just today has finally come through with something more substantial, \$500,000 for miners' relief from the steel workers. This is only a good beginning and far from the resources the CIO can and should mobilize to halt Truman's strikebreaking.

### MORE THAN RELIEF

The situation calls for more than relief to the miners, desperately as that is needed. It demands thunderous mass action and protest aimed directly at Truman. So far, Murray and the other labor allies of the Democratic administration have covered up for Truman and have said not one public word against him.

The government's deadly thrust at all labor, through its use of the T-H Law against the miners, can be warded off by the concerted action of the whole labor movement. A National Emergency Conference of Labor, with all unions participating, is needed at once to set in motion a mighty counter-offensive against the Big Business-government assault on the miners. Action should be taken by all local unions to force their national officials to convene such an emergency joint conference immediately. At the same time they should act on their own, protesting to Truman and extending all possible material aid to the miners.

## Authorities Bury FEPC Ordinance In San Francisco

SAN FRANCISCO, Jan. 31 — After nine months of hearings the San Francisco Board of Supervisors buried in committee the proposed Fair Employment Practices Ordinance. Recommended instead is a "voluntary plan" whereby the employers will undertake a "program of education" to end discriminatory hiring practices.

To hundreds of Negroes and other minorities who followed the slow progress of the ordinance who participated in the picket lines and meetings, who packed the City Hall Chambers through countless long drawn-out sessions the lesson is once more driver home that discrimination cannot be effectively fought, let alone eliminated by reliance on "good" capitalist politicians.

The proposed FEPC ordinance was drawn up under the auspices of the Council of Civic Unity, patterned after those passed in Philadelphia, Minneapolis and a few other cities. Its provisions were mild. Powers of investigation and enforcement were to be placed in the hands of a commission appointed by the Mayor. The sponsors of the measure emphasized with satisfaction that in cities where such ordinances were in force not one penalty was ever exacted.

### EXTENDED HEARINGS

The Mayor's committee heard all interested groups and individuals. Representatives of minority organizations, unions, political parties, fraternal and religious organizations, social welfare groups, totaling over 100 organizations, testified in favor of the measure; the only ones opposed were the employers organizations!

The Mayor's Committee finally reported the ordinance favorably to the Board of Supervisors. More hearings then took place through the months of October, November and December. Again over 100 organizations spoke in favor of the ordinance. Again the employers opposed it.

Finally on Jan. 5, the Committee, with only one dissenting vote, made its recommendation — no FEPC "at this time." "We do not believe," it said, "that they [supporters of FEPC] have offered substantial evidence of discriminatory practices in sufficient detail or extent to permit the invoking of police power necessary for such a law."

The Socialist Workers Party participated in every stage of the hearings as well as the conferences and picket lines. It called for a sharpening of the ordinance with increased powers of enforcement. It supported the buried FEPC measure despite its shortcomings.



Federal mediators confer with Joseph Beirne, president of the CIO Communication Workers, (left) in attempt to get postponement of threatened telephone strike. Union leaders later agreed to hold strike off until Feb. 24.

## STRIKERS PREPARE NEW DEMANDS AT CHRYSLER

DETROIT, Feb. 6 — Full-page newspaper ads by the Detroit Board of Commerce, demonstrations and new contract demands by the auto union — these actions bring into bold relief the tactics pursued by each side in the Chrysler Corporation's war against the UAW last week.

Meanwhile, militants continue to apply pressure on the company for contract changes. Denouncing the corporation's pre-strike demands for a five-year extension of the present agreement, unionists are gearing for an immediate show-down battle over contract revision. The Dodge stewards' meeting last Tuesday demanded:

1. Throw out the company security clause.
2. Include an FEPC section to prevent discriminatory hiring.
3. Strengthen seniority provisions to stop foremen from playing favorites and undermining the union.
4. Eliminate restrictions on holiday pay.
5. Get union shop and checkoff clauses.
6. Time-and-a-half for all Saturday work, regardless of whether 40 hours have previously been worked that week.

A committee set up by the Chrysler 7 stewards' body is preparing similar demands. All these are to be submitted to a national delegated Chrysler conference tomorrow.

The presentation of these demands will mark an offensive action by the union against the profit-bloated corporation. To many on the picket lines, contract changes weigh heavier in their grievances against the company

## SWP Organizer Flays Dictatorial Chief of Police

YOUNGSTOWN, Feb. 6 — A sharp attack by the Socialist Workers Party on police interference with political minorities here is producing effects in the local labor

movement and other circles. Last week at the Monday night meeting of City Council, Harry Braverman, Youngstown SWP organizer, blasted Police Chief Allen for arrests of distributors of Communist Party handbills, and for interference with public activity of other political groups. Since that time, two public distributions by the CP here at mill gates have gone without arrests, although Allen had hauled distributors to prison upon all such occasions in the past. In one case, two city detectives chased away distributors of the Stalinist Worker. This change in police policy must be regarded as resulting from the firm and well publicized stand taken by the SWP.

### "NOTHING LOWER"

At the council meeting, Braverman tore into the city police policy in a biting attack which was broadcast in full over the local radio later in the evening. "There is nothing lower or more reprehensible," he declared, "than a public official who uses his office to hound and persecute political opponents." He repeated this statement, looking straight at Allen all the while. "The charges that have been placed against the distributors are purely manufactured charges, tailored to suit the circumstances." The arrested individuals had been charged with sidewalk obstruction.

Braverman went on to arraign Allen for misuse of office for partisan political purposes. "It may be that Allen is dissatisfied with the Constitution and the existing statutes. It may be that he feels that the law should be changed so as to give Allen the right to pass on all political doctrine. If that is so, he is in the wrong end of the business. He ought to try the legislative end. But, so long as he is a police chief, he is simply entitled to enforce the existing laws impartially, and to confine himself to that function."

### NATIONAL DANGER

Braverman went on to point out the general importance of this issue in the life of the whole country. "This is not just a case of a publicity-seeking police chief trying to make a name for himself by 'saving' Youngstown from three alleged Communists. This is a national danger, which we now face squarely in Youngstown. I notice by tonight's papers that the Ku Klux Klan has met in a convention and named as the

three most dangerous Communist groups in the country the National Association for the Advancement of the Colored People, the B'nai Brith, and the Federal Council of Churches of Christ. And these are not simply crackpots devoid of influence; they run large sections of the country.

"In the city of Campbell nearby," Braverman continued, "there now is an ordinance forcing anyone who wants to distribute a handbill to have it approved by the chief of police. That is illegal and bad enough. But here in Youngstown, the police chief proceeds without benefit of law, statute, ordinance or authority in the most illegal way possible." Braverman closed with a demand that the city council act on the situation.

After Braverman's sharp denunciation, made to an audience of councilmen and city officials who were taken by surprise by such a blunt statement, Police Chief Allen, an FBI-trained flatfoot imported from Pennsylvania, made a very brief and weak reply to the effect that he intended to pursue the same course against "Communism." Allen's actions during the past week appear, however, to have become more cautious.

### OTHER REPERCUSSIONS

The radio locally for the next 18 hours buzzed with the news of what happened at the Council meeting. Radio stations featured it as the chief headline on their news broadcasts. A statement from the SWP made the next day was broadcast by one commentator in the form of a "flash" during a news commentary. And the Youngstown Vindicator, the only daily here, featured the event on its front page the following morning.

The SWP stand has brought the civil liberties issue to the attention of broad groups of people, and has caused much discussion among steel workers, despite a very strong current of red-baiting here.

A recent comment came in the published sermon of Reverend Carnes, pastor of the First Unitarian Church. Pausing in the course of a vicious attack on Communism, Rev. Carnes, who claims to be a "liberal," remarked that he seriously questions "the wisdom" of Police Chief Allen in arresting Communists for passing out literature. He called the actions "a questionable answer to the threat of Communism."

## V. R. DUNNE, JIM KUTCHER SPEAK AT N. Y. MEETING

NEW YORK, Feb. 7 — The first victim of the Smith Gag Act, Vincent Ray Dunne of Minneapolis, and the No. 1 victim of the "loyalty" purge, James Kutcher of Newark, joined forces at a public meeting here Friday night to emphasize the importance of united mass action to save civil rights.

Banners decorating the meeting hall bore slogans on the same theme calling for freeing of the 11 Communist Party victims of the Smith Act, pardon of Dunne and the other 17 labor and Trotskyist leaders victimized in the precedent-making Minneapolis trial of 1941 under the same act, and support for united opposition to the "loyalty" purge, symbolized in the Kutcher case.

### DUNNE'S ANALYSIS

Dunne, speaking on the topic with which he has been touring the country, analyzed the three-pronged attack on the working class and its allies now evident in the open shop drive of the industrialists, the "loyalty" purge of the government and the anti-democratic purge within the labor movement.

"What motivates the Wall Street masters and their minions in Washington and other departments of government" in pushing their "stream-lined witch-hunt" at this time, he said, is their need to push back the workers' movement under the control of obedient labor bureaucrats who take their orders from Washington. This is necessary to permit the bosses to cash in on World War II, to conquer the rest of the world with a "war production machine capable of supplying the armies of Amer-

## AFL Council Issues Mild Complaint On State Department Bid to Franco

After a prolonged silence the Executive Council of the AFL, meeting in Miami Beach, Fla., finally took cognizance of the State Department's avowed policy of embracing the butcher Franco. They issued a mildly critical letter, with copies to Truman, the State Department and the House and Senate Foreign Affairs committees.

Mentioning no names, and carefully evading the fact that Truman himself is directly responsible for the pro-Franco orientation of State Secretary Acheson and the ranking Democratic spokesmen in Congress, the AFL "labor statesmen" content themselves by filing their disagreements with the faulty "reasoning" allegedly behind Washington's latest move.

Such "reasoning" they complain would "inevitably lead from one fatal blunder to another." What they fear most of all, it turns out, is that the "appeasement" of butcher Franco would

harm the cause of butcher Chiang Kai-shek by logically hastening the recognition of "the Communist usurpers who . . . have overthrown the legally constituted Government of China." Their chief complaint is of course left unspoken. How can they now continue peddling their lies to the workers about the "humanitarian" and "democratic" aims of the Marshall Plan, the Atlantic Pact, and the rest of American imperialist foreign policy?

The AFL bureaucrats are in effect pleading with their capitalist masters: "Please don't embarrass us so openly in public. Please don't ask us to shake hands with Franco, as we know we must, if you insist on this policy."