

THE MILITANT

PUBLISHED WEEKLY IN THE INTERESTS OF THE WORKING PEOPLE

Vol. XVI - No. 36

NEW YORK, N. Y., MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 1952

PRICE: FIVE CENTS

Build a Labor Party, Breitman Urges CIO-PAC

NEWARK, Sept. 7 — The following open letter was sent by George Breitman, Socialist Workers Party candidate for U.S. Senator, to the New Jersey CIO Political Action Committee, meeting in state conference here at the Essex House today.

Dear Brothers and Sisters:

As Socialist Workers Party candidate for U.S. Senator in this state, I feel it is my right and duty to ask you to reconsider the political policy of your organization in this year's election.

I know that your national and state leaders have already endorsed Stevenson, Sparkman and Alexander. I know that most of you, out of a feeling of loyalty to the CIO, will probably go along

with that policy in this campaign, even if you have doubts about part or all of that policy.

But it's your obligation to the workers you represent to know what you're doing and where you're going. Most labor and liberal leaders claim they won a great victory at the Democratic convention. That's not true. Senator Humphrey of Minnesota was correct when he said, "There is no use denying that Farley and the Dixiecrats gave us a trouncing."

STEVENSON AND T-H

Your leaders blocked the nomination of Barkley (not because he was too old but because the conservative elements of the party, like Farley, were uniting behind him). But that "victory" amounted to nothing because they weren't able to block the nomination of Stevenson, who was also Farley's choice, who is acceptable to the Southern reactionaries, and who is more conservative than Barkley on many issues.

The CIO News has put out a voting record which condemns the Congressmen who voted in favor of the Byrd amendment calling on Truman to use the Taft-Hartley Act to break the recent CIO steel strike.

Do you know that last spring, when the steel workers were on the picket line fighting for decent living standards, Stevenson made a speech in Oregon and publicly called for use of the Taft-Hartley Act in the steel strike? If it was a victory to block Barkley, who voted against the Taft-Hartley Act, wasn't it a defeat not to block the nomination of Stevenson, who says he favors some parts of the Taft-Hartley Act?

SLAP IN THE FACE

Labor leaders try to justify working inside and with the Democratic Party by their success in blocking Barkley and Russell, and by the "concessions" they got in the Democratic platform. But they couldn't even block the nomination of Sparkman, who functioned, at the convention as Russell's floor leader.

Sparkman's nomination was a slap in the face to labor and the Negro people, and you know it. The Newark News (Aug. 19), reporting a long debate in the Essex-West Hudson CIO-PAC, said: "Some Negro delegates complained that they had trouble selling Stevenson to their locals because of Sparkman."

And rightly so! Sparkman stands for most of the things the CIO has fought against, and Stevenson showed what kind of "liberal" he was when he picked Sparkman.

CIO AND SPARKMAN

Do you remember that only a few months ago the national CIO called on the Democratic Party to kick out those members who gang up with the Republicans in Congress to vote against progressive measures promised in the Democratic platform?

Sparkman was one of the men your leaders were referring to then. He voted against the wage-

(Continued on page 2)

Stevenson Uses Double-Talk In Bid for Votes of Workers



NEWS ITEM: Rep. Adam Clayton Powell Jr. (D., N. Y.), who is minister of Harlem's largest church, threatened to call for Negro boycott of Democratic national ticket and then gave the Stevenson-Sparkman slate his blessing after conference with Gov. Stevenson.

POWELL BACKS DEMOCRATS AFTER CHEAP PROMISE ON NEGRO RIGHTS

By Myra T. Weiss
SWP Candidate for Vice President

Representative Adam Clayton Powell's switch back to the Stevenson-Sparkman ticket will be hailed with delight by the Dixiecrats. But it won't be liked by Negro and white fighters for civil rights who are beginning to see through the trickery of the two-party system.



MYRA TANNER WEISS

The Congressman from Harlem refused to support Stevenson and Sparkman at the Democratic convention, and threatened to boycott them in November. He charged that the Negro people were "sold down the river" by the "ambiguous" promises in the Democratic platform.

In July he rejected these "ambiguous" promises as completely unsatisfactory. A month later he has a private talk with Stevenson, and says that HIS promises are completely satisfactory. Swallowing Sparkman, he has crawled back to the slate that is also being supported by the white supremacists.

MAGIC WORDS

But the Negro people did not have any private talk with Stevenson and they did not hear the magic words that got Congressman Powell to make his flip-flop. Their suspicion, doubt and hostility toward the Democratic Party's appeasement of the Dixiecrats are not going to disappear merely because Powell places the interests of the Democrats ahead of the struggle against Jim Crow.

Nothing has changed, except Powell. No matter what Stevenson told Powell, and no matter what Powell tells the Negro people, the Democratic Party is still the party of big promises and no action on civil rights. Truman promised more than Stevenson does, and Truman never got a civil rights law passed. Why should the Negro people believe Stevenson will do any better?

KEY QUESTION

Supporters of civil rights still have to settle the question for themselves: Should they keep on voting for the capitalist parties that have given them nothing but a runaround on civil rights promises, written or verbal? Or should they break with the Democratic and Republican parties in favor of a program to transfer political power to a new party based on the labor and Negro movements, which have everything to gain and nothing to lose from abolishing Jim Crow?

That's what the Socialist Workers Party stands for. It doesn't ask for, and it doesn't want, votes from anybody except confirmed opponents of Jim Crow oppression and exploitation. But it deserves to get the votes of all such Americans.

Illinois Record Of Stevenson Is 'Foretaste' Of Two More Parties Denied Ballot Rights

CHICAGO, Sept. 2 — A "fore-taste" of a national Stevenson administration was seen by Irving Beinin, Socialist Workers Party candidate for Congress in the Illinois 2nd Congressional District. Beinin pointed to the violations of civil liberties in his state as examples.

Beinin's statement said: "The barring of the Progressive and Prohibition parties from the Illinois ballot is a direct attack on all civil liberties. The administration of Governor Adlai Stevenson has made it quite clear that he wishes to maintain the elections as the private preserve of the Democratic-Republican Party."

"Gov. Adlai Stevenson is the same man who signed Illinois House Bill 100 which effectively prevented Farrell Dobbs and Myra Tanner Weiss, the SWP presidential and vice-presidential candidates from appearing on the Illinois ballot this Nov. 4."

"We here in Illinois have had a foretaste of what a Stevenson administration would hold in store for the American people. This 'democrat' believes in freedom only for those who agree with him. Let the American workers be on guard against this demagogue."

Another Illinois resident, writing to the St. Louis Post-Dispatch from the mining region in the southern part of the state, said that "Stevenson considers the votes and campaign money from the oil companies more important than the lives of the miners."

"If Stevenson were elected President," writes D. O. Scanlan, "the new federal mine safety law would not be worth the paper it is written on. No such sly conniving politician should be elevated to the presidency."

For President



FARRELL DOBBS

Election Fund Reaches \$13,609; Up \$1,511 in Week

By Reba Aubrey
Fund Campaign Manager

Payments this week of \$1,511 from the Socialist Workers Party branches on their pledges to help finance the Presidential Election and carry on the challenge to the constitutionality of the reactionary Trucks Law in Michigan raised the national total through Sept. 2 to \$13,609. This is 73% of the 18,600 pledged and brings the campaign within 3% of being on schedule. We cut the 6% lag of last week in half.

Three more branches — Akron, Buffalo and St. Louis — pounded over the goal line to share top honors with Connecticut and Allentown. Although the campaign was extended one month, these branches held their sights to the original closing date of Aug. 30.

Kay Kean says for Akron: "Enclosed is our final thirty bucks. There is an outside post- (Continued on page 2)

Wants T-H Law Under New Name

By Farrell Dobbs
SWP Presidential Candidate

Gov. Adlai Stevenson, my Democrat opponent for the U.S. Presidency, is not for unconditional repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. He is for retaining some of the most obnoxious features of that Slave Labor Law — but disguised under another name.

Any union leader who represents Stevenson as a "friend of labor" on the basis of his latest statement on the Taft-Hartley Act is helping to perpetrate a fraud on the American workers.

The whole purpose of Stevenson's Labor Day speech in Detroit was to mislead and deceive the workers. It was an adroit, slick job of doubletalk intended to give the pro-Democrat union officials some phrases they might use to sell Stevenson to the workers.

THE OLD SHELL GAME

Even if you heard Stevenson's speech on TV or in person, I advise you to read the full text — carefully. You'll find that Stevenson has played a variation on the old shell game. If that game is based on the maxim that the hand is quicker than the eye; Stevenson's speech follows the theory that the tongue is quicker than the ear.

It is true that Stevenson spoke of the Taft-Hartley Law as a "tangled snarl of legal barbed wire, filled with ugly sneers at labor unions." But he is far from regarding Taft-Hartley as an un-mixed evil.

"I don't say that everything in the Taft-Hartley Act is wrong. I don't think it is a 'slave labor law,'" Stevenson added. But, he explains, "what should be retained can be written into the new law best after the political symbolism of the Taft-Hartley act is behind us."

In short, Stevenson wants to retain the essence of the Taft-Hartley Act, but do away with the "political symbolism" — its name and origin as an openly anti-labor law passed by a Republican Congress in 1947 amid a lynch atmosphere against the unions.

Stevenson enumerated three curbs on unions, first imposed by Taft-Hartley, that he would reenact in a new law if Taft-Hartley were repealed.

WOULD LIMIT POWER

He would limit the power of the unions to establish their own conditions for membership and force them to "conform to standards of fair conduct and equal protection" devised by the capitalist government. He would also forbid certain "unfair union practices." And, finally, he would provide "the President with a choice of procedures, for intervention in industry-wide strikes."

I do not need to discuss in detail the anti-union hooks in Stevenson's proposals. I see that such rock-ribbed anti-labor, Big Business newspapers as the N.Y. Times and the N.Y. Herald-Tribune both find that Stevenson's main proposals for curbs on unions are "sound" — a word which connotes sterling worth in the language of capitalist enterprise.

FAR CRY FROM PROMISE

What Stevenson proposed today, it is obvious, is a far cry from the original promise of Truman and the Democratic Party in 1948 for unconditional repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. And certainly there is no reason to believe that Stevenson, if elected, would wage any more of a fight for Taft-Hartley repeal than Truman over the past four years.

(Continued on page 4)

DEMOCRATS CHALLENGE CHICAGO SWP PETITIONS

By Bert Deck

CHICAGO, Aug. 28 — The Socialist Workers Party continued its fight for a free ballot in Illinois at a public hearing of the Cook County Election Board today on the petitions of Irving Beinin, SWP candidate for Congress from the 2nd Congressional District.

The Socialist candidate's petitions were challenged Aug. 28 by Marie Antoinette de Roulet, who described herself as "a citizen . . . interested in the democratic process." Also present at the hearing was Mr. Beinin's Democratic opponent, ex-Congressman Barrett O'Hara. Mr. O'Hara described himself as "a disinterested observer of the proceeding."

Irving Beinin's right to appear on the Nov. 4 ballot was challenged on the following grounds:

1. He is a member of an organization described by certain federal agencies as subversive.
2. He did not sign a loyalty oath when filing his petitions.
3. Two petition circulators were not registered voters in the 2nd Congressional district at the time of circulation.
4. All the signers of the petitions were either not registered voters or had voted in the Spring primaries.

Attorney M. J. Myer, Mr. Beinin's counsel, skillfully exploded, one by one, the technical legal arguments presented in the challenge. He pointed out that the loyalty oath provision of the Illinois Statutes explicitly applies only to candidates filing in the primaries and not to independent candidates in the general elections. He presented documentary

Dobbs-Weiss Tour Schedule

— See Page 2 —

SWP Reply to Women's League

NEWARK, N. J., Aug. 25 — George Breitman, Socialist Workers Party candidate for U.S. Senator in New Jersey, last week gave the following answers to the 1952 questionnaire for congressional candidates sent to him by the League of Women Voters (replies were limited to 100 words for each question):

Question: What particular training and experience have you had that would qualify you for this office?

Answer: I have personally experienced the effects of the great depression; military service in World War II; inflation fostered by profiteering, and failure to control it; the run-around both major parties have given us on civil rights; the attempts they have made to impose thought-control on the American people; and other consequences of foreign and domestic policies leading to a new world war. Studying these evils taught me they are products

of a capitalist system in crisis and of the two-party system. If elected, I would use my office to promote formation of an independent labor party to end these evils.

Question: A (1). What should U.S. policy be with respect to the United Nations?

Answer: Quit dominating it; quit using it to intensify the cold war; quit forcing it to continue the war in Korea; quit using it to aid discredited totalitarians like Chiang Kai-shek and Franco; quit helping it to deny independence and self-determination for colonial countries; quit making Western Europe rearm against its wishes; quit occupation and division of Germany; quit opposition to recognition of China; quit pressure against East-West trade.

Question: A (2). What should U.S. policy be with respect to aid to under-developed countries?

Answer: Help them build factories, homes, schools, dams, hospitals, not military bases. Send

them men with tools and skill, not men with guns. Give them economic help, not political interference and dictation.

Question: B. What steps should Congress take to halt inflation?

Answer: Impose rigid price and rent controls to be policed by committees of trade unionists, housewives, shopkeepers and farmers. Enact a law automatically raising wages, pensions and unemployment compensation whenever the cost of living goes up. Tax the rich, not the poor. Abolish all taxes on incomes below \$7,500 a year. Nationalize the basic industries, all war plants, all banks, all natural resources, and operate them in the interests of producers and consumers by democratically-elected committees of workers and technicians. Put a 100% tax on all arms industry profits.

Question: C. Where can federal expenditure best be cut?

Answer: Above all, by ending the war preparations, the war in Korea, and the draft. Also, by

discontinuing all appropriations used by the Department of Justice and other governmental agencies to persecute and penalize people merely because of their thoughts, expressions, writings and associations.

Question: D. In what pieces of legislation are you especially interested (please state support or opposition)?

Answer: I favor laws to let the American people vote on war or peace in a national referendum; to withdraw U.S. troops from Korea; to build 20,000,000 federal low-cost housing units; to provide free medical attention and hospitalization for all through a national health service; to build federal nurseries for children of working mothers; to enact a compulsory federal FEPC law with real teeth; to abolish segregation and the poll tax; to punish lynch-terrorists; and to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act, Smith Act, McCarran concentration camp law and McCarran-Walters anti-immigration law.

