

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

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'

Two More Parties Denied Ballot Rights

CHICAGO, Sept. 2 — A "foretaste" 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 possibility of more."

(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)

OVER THE TOP IN LOS ANGELES

Word has just arrived that our campaigners in Myra Tanner Weiss' home town have all the signatures in the bag to put Milt Snipper on the ballot for Congress from the 19th District. They got the 7,500 and more signatures than the law requires. If anyone thinks that's like rolling off a log, just mull over these facts for a moment. The 7,500 signatures have to be garnered out of a total of some 46,000 persons who didn't vote in the primaries. And all of that has to be done in some 17 days. And after you get through with this rat-race, you have to worry that some crooked politician doesn't haul you in court like in Chicago to combine a little technical quibbling with a lot of red-baiting to throw you off the ballot.

We haven't space to give all the details of L.A.'s magnificent ballot campaign for Milt Snipper. They worked hard in a streamlined organization, taking care of meals, transportation and — babies. Many of the volunteer workers gave up their vacations to put in full time on the job.

Milt Snipper is a garment cutter, a long-time respected member of the ILGWU, and works in the shop right now. How many candidates like that can you find in the country — outside our party?

MINNESOTA STATE CONVENTION

The Socialist Workers Party state organization in Minnesota will have held its state convention (Sept. 5) by the time this paper is off the press. Their advance publicity announces that in addition to ratifying the nominations of Dobbs and Weiss, they will consider the nomination of Vincent R. Dunne for U.S. Senator. We doubt he will have any challengers — although there's plenty of opportunity for that in our party — because the name of Vincent Dunne is a grand thing in the history of Minnesota labor. He should be the Senator from Minnesota if the workers really want representation in Congress.

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.

Dobbs-Weiss Tour Schedule

— See Page 2 —

'I Talked With the North Korean Prisoners of War'

By Joseph Keller
AUG. 29 — "I talked with plenty of North Korean and Chinese prisoners of war in the hospital compounds. I didn't find one who said, when I asked him, that he didn't want to go back to his own country."
An American GI who has returned within the past three weeks from many months of Army service in Korea and Japan told me the above today in an interview.
The tall, thin soldier — who had picked up a working knowledge of the Korean language — spent most of a year at the big hospital prison-camp near Pusan. "There were about 15,000 prisoners there."
"Where I was, was the nearest thing to an ideal spot for PWs to be at. Not like Kojé. They appeared to be getting adequate food and got fairly good treatment. So if there was any place where you'd expect to find PWs who'd say they would 'forcibly resist' repatriation, it should have been where I was."

"Yet, from the whole experience I had with North Koreans and Chinese, I doubt if 10 per cent would refuse to be repatriated."

CONTRADICTS U.S. CLAIMS
These conclusions — drawn from direct contact with POWs in South Korean compounds — are in sharp contradiction to the claims of the U.S. military command that 100,000 out of 170,000 POWs in a "poll" last April said they would "forcibly resist" repatriation. The U.S. negotiators have been using the alleged results of this "poll" to hold up a truce.
"I had already left for Japan when they had that riot in the compound. But I read in Time magazine about how we sent troops with tear gas and grenades against these people and the amputees fought our men with their crutches."
"That's a funny thing. Most of the reasons used to explain the riots in Kojé didn't apply where I was. They said the Communists

were in control at Kojé because of the big compounds, which were 'uncontrollable' by our forces. They said the Communists could terrorize the others."

"But in our camp near Pusan the compounds were small. The Communists couldn't use violence to intimidate the others. If the PWs were against this 'voluntary repatriation' poll, it wasn't because they feared the Communists."

FOR NORTH KOREAN REFORMS
Was there any evidence of positive support for the North Korean regime?
"Yes. Regardless of whether they were Communists or not, they were for the land reform of the North Korean regime. They were really enthusiastic about the breaking up of the land and distribution to landless peasants."
How did he get the POWs to talk to him and take the risk of giving answers their captors would not like?
"They have to trust you first, otherwise they will tell you what they think you'd like to hear. At first they will pretend to be anti-Communist. But when you get them to trust you, they will admit their real sentiments."
"You'd be surprised some of the things they know about our country. They all seemed to know about Jim Crow in this country. One Chinese even recalled to me the Boxer Rebellion which he said was put down by a 'UN police action' like the 'police action' in Korea."

Watch Napalm Bombing



Outpost observers of First Marine Division watch smoke rise over "Bunker Hill" in Korea as napalm bomb is dropped on North Korean troops by U.S. plane. Flaming jellied gasoline, described by observers as the most terrible weapon next to the atom bomb, has been dropped indiscriminately over Korea, taking a big toll of Korean civilians as well as North Korean and Chinese troops.

been used against Korean civilians? Had he had any experience with napalm?
"I saw victims of napalm among the PWs," he replied. "It burns a wide area of the body and sets up terrible secondary infections."
"It's ridiculous to talk about napalm and say it doesn't kill civilians. It spreads and obliterates large sections of the countryside. With the type of scorched-earth campaign we used against the villages we couldn't possibly fail to burn up civilians."
Although he did not participate directly in the fighting, he saw some of the areas which had been fought over.
SMASHED INTO RUBBLE
"I saw the villages smashed to hell — into rubble — and mostly by U.S. heavy artillery and bombs. They follow a policy of wiping out every town and hut they think guerrillas or enemy troops might use to hide in, or where supplies might be stored."
"They don't ask questions — just destroy everything in sight. I'd say nine out of every ten places you'd see destroyed were ruined by our side."
What is the attitude of the

Koreans to the American troops and of the GIs to the Koreans? He found that a rather complex situation to explain.

"So far as the Koreans are concerned, they would seem to be fairly friendly. But then the most contact we had with Koreans was with those who work in our camps and then only while they are working under us."

"But there was almost never any visiting with Koreans where they lived. The American uniform is a barrier. The Korean civilian and the American soldier just have a lack of interest in each other. One has no use for the other. Of course, the GIs who were there in 1950 wouldn't trust any Korean. They said that even those working with our Army were giving information to the enemy."

JIM CROW ATTITUDE
"I have to admit that our men don't have a very good attitude toward the Koreans. They speak with contempt of the Koreans and they show this contempt openly. I'd say there is an element of a Jim-Crow attitude."

"An American who treats Koreans as equals is called a 'gook-lover,' just like they call a white man who treats Negroes fairly in this country a 'nigger-lover.' I was called the former quite often for not displaying the proper contempt for Koreans."

"Of course, the Army regulations formally say that we should remember to treat the Koreans like 'brothers.' But the officers really laugh at that. I heard one officer giving a lecture on the regulations. He pointed to the handbook and said: 'It says here you're to treat gooks as equals.'"

WANT TO COME HOME
What leads to the GI attitude? I asked.

"They don't want to be there. They resent being in the Army and in the war. They reflect this in their hatred of Korea and every one in it. They certainly wish it was somebody else there instead of themselves. 'The gooks don't appreciate what we're doing for them — liberating them from the Communists.' That's a widespread attitude."

He said that he had been in Japan during the great demonstrations there in May, "but we were kept to quarters. In Japan there is outright hostility by civilians to the Americans."

One of the most interesting facts he told about Japan is that there are more than a half million Koreans there. "Their situation is something like that of the Negroes in our country. They are second-class citizens. They have the chance to see both sides in the war in Korea. But they are almost entirely pro-North Korean."

"So far as I learned, they wouldn't even try to recruit any Koreans from Japan to serve in the South Korean army. They may have tried in the beginning but gave it up pretty fast."

"The Koreans in Japan maintain their own villages and schools. You know, they have an organized defense system against the Japanese police. They have a system of raid warnings and they all pour out together to drive off the police with knives, poles or any other weapons they can pick up easily and quickly."

One of the ironic things he pointed out was that when he entered the Army in 1950, the fellows who were taken in with him "were not too worried about being sent to Korea because they thought the war would soon be over." That was after the Inchon landing. "I guess they think differently now — the ones that are alive, I mean."

The American Way of Life

The Right Backs to Stab

An ad for a book called *How to Succeed in Business Without Really Trying*, The Dastard's Handbook to Fame and Fortune by Shepherd Mead intrigued us so much that we reproduce it here without any charge to the publishers:

"Now you, too, can be an S.O.B.* (*Successful Opportunist in Business)."

"Men, are you having trouble finding the right backs to stab? Do you know which faces to step on? Can you appear busy when you're not? This completely reprehensible, immoral and unscrupulous little book tells you all about how to get a raise... apple-polishing... credit-grabbing... how to get on top of the heap without any merit whatsoever... in short, everything you need to know about Getting Ahead."

This reminded us of the story behind a brand new green and gold Cadillac now being driven around Los Angeles by a young lawyer named Nick Spanos as told a couple of months ago in one of the weekly news magazines.

Spanos started after the Cadillac while still attending Harvard Law School in 1946. Choosing the movie industry as his field for operations, he wrote a thesis on the anti-trust suits against the motion picture distributors, in which he attempted to refute all the government charges. The bright young student found him-

self working for the Motion Picture Association in New York soon after graduation, and shortly after that he was hired by a Hollywood firm which was busy defending motion picture exhibitors in anti-trust suits.

PROFITABLE SWITCH

In 1948, Spanos met an independent movie house owner by the name of William D. Fulton, who claimed that he had been victimized by the Fox National Theater chain. Spanos quit his Hollywood law firm and filed an anti-trust suit against the industry. He collected treble damages, which, with interest, amounted to a cool one-and-a-third million dollars. Spanos' fee in this deal was almost a quarter of a million smackers: hence the Cadillac.

Soon, Spanos had eight more suits pending against Fox National Theaters, which is run by Charles Skouras.

TROUBLE ON SUNDAYS

Spanos is having a little trouble on Sundays. (We forgot to mention that he is a churchgoing man.) "At church recently," Spanos related, "Skouras called me a racketeer and yelled that I was trying to get rich off him. I told him: 'Why, you have always been one of my heroes. There's nothing personal in this. I don't wish you anything but the best of luck.'"

All of this makes me think that this new dastard's handbook (they seemed to have changed the spelling since I went to school) might be worth reading. But I wish it had been written by Nick Spanos. Theory is all right, but when you really want to learn, keep your eye on a practical man.

— By Harry Frankel

Farrell Dobbs Tour Schedule

- Sept. 12-15 Buffalo
Public Meeting: Sept. 13, 8 P.M. Hotel Lafayette
- Sept. 17-19 Boston
Sept. 20-21 Newark
Public Meeting: Sept. 21, 8 P.M. 52 Market Street (Corner of Plane)
- Sept. 22-24 Philadelphia
Sept. 26-29 New York
Oct. 2-5 Los Angeles
Oct. 7-9 San Francisco-Oakland
Oct. 11-13 Seattle
Oct. 16-18 Minneapolis-St. Paul
Oct. 19-20 Milwaukee
Oct. 21-24 Chicago
Oct. 26 St. Louis
Oct. 28-Nov. 2 Detroit-Flint-Toledo

Myra T. Weiss Tour Schedule

- Sept. 12-17 Chicago
Public Meeting: In Chicago Sept. 13, 8:30 P.M. 734 South Wabash
- Sept. 19-23 Detroit-Flint
Sept. 25-28 Minneapolis-St. Paul
Sept. 30-Oct. 1 Akron
Oct. 2-3 Youngstown
Oct. 4-5 Cleveland
Oct. 7-10 Buffalo
Oct. 12-16 Boston
Oct. 17-18 Newark
Oct. 19-20 Philadelphia
Oct. 21 Allentown
Oct. 23-26 New York
Oct. 27 New Haven
Oct. 29-31 San Francisco-Oakland
Nov. 1-2 Los Angeles

Local Addresses Of Socialist Workers Party

- AKRON — For information, write P. O. Box 1342.
- BOSTON — Workers Educational Center, 30 Stuart St., Open Tues. 7:30-9 P.M. Social last Sat. of every month.
- BUFFALO — Milant Forum, 639 Main Street, 2nd fl. Open every afternoon except Sun. Phone Madison 3-890.
- CHICAGO — 734 S. Wabash Ave. Open daily except Sunday, 12-6:00 P.M. Phone (Harrison) 7-0403.
- CLEVELAND — 10009 Superior Ave. DETROIT — 4108 Linwood Ave. Open Mon. through Sat., 12-5 P.M. Phone 7-5267.
- FLINT — SWP, 1507 Oak Street. Phone 2-2996.
- LOS ANGELES — 1702 East 4th St. Phone ANeelus 9-4953.
- MILWAUKEE — 817 N. 3rd St., 3rd fl. Open Sun. through Fri. 7:30-9:30 P.M.
- MINNEAPOLIS — 10 South 4th St. Open daily except Sun. 10 A.M.-6 P.M. Library, bookstore. Phone Main 7781.
- NEW HAVEN — For information, write P.O. Box 1019.
- NEWARK — 62 Market St., cor. Plane.
- NEW YORK CITY — 116 University Place. Phone AL 6-7692.
- BROOKLYN — 18 Nevins Street, 2nd floor.
- OAKLAND (Cal.) — For information write P.O. Box 1953.
- PHILADELPHIA — 1308-95 W. Girard Ave., 2nd fl. Open every Fri. evening. Phone Stevenson 4-5820.
- ST. LOUIS — For information, Phone MO 7194.
- ST. PAUL — Phone State headquarters, Main 7781.
- SAN FRANCISCO — 1739 Fillmore St. 4th fl. Open daily except Sunday, 12-4:30 P.M. Phone FT 6-6410.
- SEATTLE — Maynard Bldg., 1st Ave. So. and Washington, Rm. 201, Open Mon. through Sat. 12-5 P.M. Branch meeting every Thurs. 7:30 P.M. Library, bookstore. Phone Main 8278.
- YOUNGSTOWN — 724 W. Palmer St.

\$18,600 FUND SCOREBOARD			
Branch	Pledge	Paid	Percent
Connecticut	\$ 125	\$ 137	110
Allentown	40	43	108
Akron	150	150	100
Buffalo	1,500	1,500	100
St. Louis	50	50	100
Cleveland	300	264	88
Boston	500	430	86
Philadelphia	350	298	85
Minneapolis-St. Paul	1,500	1,244	83
New York	4,500	3,651	81
Chicago	1,500	1,189	79
Detroit	2,113	1,638	78
Seattle	400	306	77
San Francisco	900	626	69
Newark	1,000	640	64
Milwaukee	325	130	40
Flint	300	118	39
Pittsburgh	40	15	38
Youngstown	400	150	38
Los Angeles	2,200	800	36
Oakland	300	92	31
General	150	338	225
Total through Sept. 2	\$18,600	\$13,609	73

ELECTION FUND REACHES \$13,609; RISES \$1,511

(Continued from Page 1)
sibility that a few more dollars may come in. But as you see, we completed our pledge in the originally prescribed three-month period."

Last week G. Frank sent \$122 for Buffalo, saying: "Despite the extension we intend to fulfill our promise to pay our pledge of \$1,500 by Aug. 30." This morning's mail brought \$297, the amount that sent Buffalo over the top. "In answer to your question as to how we raised our pledge from \$1,000 to \$1,500 and still managed to pay it within three months," Comrade Frank informs us, "the comrades understood the necessity for the fund campaign, made their pledges accordingly, and paid as quickly as they could."

St. Louis' \$10 was accompanied by this note: "We are making a strong effort to collect donations from friends and hope to exceed our quota considerably."
In addition to the five branches that have completed their pledges, the following eight branches are ahead of schedule with 77% or better: Cleveland, Boston, Philadelphia, Minneapolis-St. Paul, New York, Chicago, Detroit and Seattle.

Boston's \$33 and Minneapolis-St. Paul's \$100 chalked up a 7% gain for each.

Newark Meetings
George Clarke
on
Why We Need a Labor Party
Fri., Sept. 12, 8:30
A Campaign Talk by Farrell Dobbs
(Candidate for President)
Sun., Sept. 21, 8:00
at 52 Market St.
(corner of Plane)

Build a Labor Party, Breitman Urges PAC

(Continued from page 1)
hour law, FEPC, abolition of the poll tax, anti-lynching bills and restrictions on filibusters. Now you are being asked to go out, ring doorbells, collect money and round up votes to elect this man.
Archibald Alexander, Democratic candidate for Senator, made this all to a group of Negro leaders at Essex House last week: While Sparkman "may not be a liberal by New Jersey standards, he is by Southern standards." (Newark News, Aug. 26). Are you CIO members now going to be guided by Southern standards of "liberalism"?
SUCKER-BAIT
"But," the top labor leaders say, "we won a big victory with the Democratic platform, the best in its history," etc., etc.
You have learned from experience that major party platforms are just words. You liked the 1948 Democratic platform, but not one of its promises was paid off.
Capitalist party platforms don't mean anything because the candidates decide what the platform is. Your leaders point to the platform's promise to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act, but both Stevenson and Sparkman want to retain some of its worst features. Your leaders interpret the platform as promising a curb on filibusters, but Stevenson and Sparkman, who would have to put this promise into action if elected, both refuse to commit themselves on it. Your leaders interpret the platform as pledging a compulsory federal FEPC, but Stevenson is against that and Sparkman, who wrote the platform, says: "All I ask a person to do is read and study the platform. You can't find FEPC mentioned in it, and there's no word of compulsion."

The platform is sucker-bait, and nothing else. Why fool yourselves on its meaning, or help to fool anybody else?
SHIFT TO THE RIGHT
Stop and think it over for yourselves, disregarding all the phony propaganda, and I think you'll have to come to this conclusion: The Democratic Party is moving steadily to the right. No matter who wins, the next President will be more openly conservative than Truman. That means labor and the Negro people will get even less from a Democratic victory than they got in 1948-'52, when their chief

"benefits" were an undeclared war in Korea, higher prices, higher taxes, the smashing of rent controls, refusal to pass a single civil rights law, the expansion of the witch hunt against civil liberties, the McCarran concentration camp law, and a round-up on almost everything they were promised.
Stevenson and Sparkman are personal symbols of this shift to the right. They are a warning that if you keep on tagging along behind the Democratic machine, the only change you will get will be from bad to worse.

REUTHER'S PRAISE
Instead of admitting this fact openly and advocating new policies to meet the new situation, most labor leaders are accommodating themselves to the rightward shift, and pretending that it is a change for the better. Walter Reuther, who is scheduled to speak to you today, is one example.
In 1948 Reuther called Truman the candidate of labor and not of Big Business, and said he should be elected for that reason. This year he praises Stevenson because "he is not a candidate of labor, not a candidate of industry," and says he should be elected for that reason.

Is that what you want — a long step backward mislabeled as "progress"? You don't need a Political Action Committee for that — the Democrats will give it to you for nothing.
THE ROAD FOR LABOR
There is only one way for the labor movement to stop the change from bad to worse — and that is to break with the two-party system and form a Labor Party.

Labor is strong enough to build its own party in the United States (the only country where labor still tolerates a policy of company unionism in politics). Sixteen million union men and women, together with their families, and the Negro people and working farmers, constitute an overwhelming majority of the population. Organized as a really independent political force, they could vote out the political stooges of Big Business in both old parties and elect their own representatives to enact a program in their own interests.

It can be done. Those who say it can't are like the people who used to claim that the mass industries of this country could never be organized and that industrial unionism was impossible.

"WELFARE STATE" OR SOCIALISM

by ART PREIS
40 Pages — 10 Cents
With a foreword on the events in Korea
A popular exposition of the promises and record of the Truman administration, demonstrating from authoritative sources how the "Fair Deal" has become a War Deal and the "Welfare State" a Warfare State.
An analysis of the role of the labor leaders and a program for militant workers.
Order from
PIONEER PUBLISHERS
116 University Place, New York 3, N. Y.

STALIN'S FRAME-UP SYSTEM

AND
THE MOSCOW TRIALS
By LEON TROTSKY
The full text of Trotsky's masterful analysis of the Moscow Trials in his summation speech before the John Dewey Commission of Inquiry which investigated Stalin's frame-up charges.
AN introduction by Joseph Hansen which brings the record of Stalin's frame-up system up-to-date and includes an analysis of recent trials in Eastern Europe.
168 pages \$1.00
PIONEER PUBLISHERS
116 University Place New York 3, N. Y.

The Jim Crow Murder

of Mr. and Mrs. Harry T. Moore

By GEORGE BREITMAN

10c

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

116 University Place New York 3, N. Y.

Latest Catalogue on Request

Subscribe!

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

Name
Street Zone
City State
☐ \$1 Six months ☐ \$2 Full year ☐ New ☐ Renewal

THE MILITANT

Published Weekly in the Interests of the Working People
THE MILITANT PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION
116 University Pl., N. Y. 3, N. Y. Phone: AL 5-7460

Editor: GEORGE BREITMAN Business Manager: JOSEPH HANSEN
Subscription: \$2 per year; \$1 for 6 months. Foreign: \$3.50 per year;
\$2 for 6 months. Single Copies (5 or more copies): 5c each in U.S.,
4c each in foreign countries.
Signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent The Mil-
itant's policies. These are expressed in its editorials.
Entered as second class matter March 7, 1944 at the Post Office
at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879.

Vol. XVI - No. 36

Monday, September 8, 1952

1. Their Campaign Opens

General Eisenhower opened his campaign with a gun-waving call before the American Legion convention for a crusade to "free" all territories now dominated by or associated with the Soviet Union. Governor Stevenson chose a softer opening.

Stevenson utilized the American Legion rostrum as a sounding board for verbal concessions on civil rights; and remarks that would have sounded tame enough before a different audience gave an illusion of liberalism against the rabid background of the witch-hunting Legionnaire parley.

This sharp political move was immediately followed by verbal concessions on the Taft-Hartley Law before the traditionally militant workers of Detroit and by similar verbal concessions at Hamtramck on the war drive.

Stevenson's course up to now shows that he is a shrewd and designing power politician with a clear understanding of the composition of his own party and of the class forces to which he must appeal.

Before the Chicago convention, Stevenson needed to appear independent of the tainted Truman gang who picked him as heir to the White House and the vast federal patronage trough. Hence the farce of Stevenson's insistent "noes" about the nomination and Truman's "displeasure" at his "reluctance."

At the Democratic convention, Stevenson wooed the Southern Bourbons. He gave the Dixiecrat wing of the Democratic party what they wanted, a weasel-worded plank on civil rights and Jim-Crow-minded Sparkman as his running mate.

In the national campaign, however, Stevenson finds it necessary, as did Truman and Roosevelt before him, to appeal to the masses who have kept the Democrats in power for two decades. But here, in the absence of a labor opposition as tough as the Dixiecrats, he makes no genuine concessions.

Instead, he provides the ward-heel trade union bureaucrats, weak-kneed liberals and Uncle Tom Negro leaders with the liberal phrases they need to sell the Democratic party.

2. Hook, Line and Sinker

Some of the liberals seem to think they are witnessing the miracle of a new Roosevelt arising from the ashes to which Truman reduced the New Deal. Take I. F. Stone, well-known columnist of the N. Y. Compass, for instance. Before the conventions of the two major parties he was sick at heart, almost prepared to take a straight reactionary in the White House in place of the hypocrisy of the Truman administration.

Now he is "grateful" to Stevenson. "One week has made clear," he writes in the Aug. 31 Compass, "that this is no Tweedledum-Tweedledee campaign. The two candidates are moving further apart on foreign policy. At home Stevenson's courage is already having its effect. When a man of his stature tells off the bigots and gets away with it, he gives new hope and courage all down the line. I take my hat off to Adlai Stevenson."

If a prominent representative of the left liberals like Stone feels impelled to take his hat off in tribute to Stevenson, one might expect some of the Wall Street crowd to be holding their hats down in alarm. But such is not the case.

The influential N.Y. Times (Sept. 2) scoffs at any "divergence" on foreign policy in either the platforms or views of the two major party candidates. "What is at issue is how and by whom policy is to be implemented." The Times prefers Eisenhower to do the implementing.

Ralph Hendershot, financial editor of the pro-Eisenhower N.Y. World Telegram, observes (Sept. 3) that "business and financial leaders" would "prefer to see Ike take the honors. . . but grapevine reports suggest that the Democrats' pride and joy would be found satisfactory also. . . no one seemed to be particularly disturbed over his declaration that the Taft-Hartley Act should be tossed out and another law enacted to cover the labor issue. . . Both candidates appear to believe we must carry on with our defense program, so the danger of a sudden change in government spending is not to be anticipated."

Finally, the Wall Street Journal, (Sept. 3), revealing some "second thoughts" about Stevenson, expects he would continue Truman's program. "He would do it without freezers and mink coats and he would certainly do it more urbanely than it has been done. . . But we think he would do it."

3. Labor Must Raise Its Sights

Anyone with visions of Stevenson making new concessions, such as Roosevelt made to the working people, is living in the dead past. It was Roosevelt himself who publicly buried the New Deal. The New Deal was now the War Deal.

Truman carried on the tradition. His "Fair" Deal turned out to be the "loyalty" purge, the witch-hunt, preparations for World War III and the invasion of Korea. As the head of the capitalist government, this course was laid down for him by Big Business.

To continue the Roosevelt course, means to continue the rule of Big Business, and under present world conditions that means continuation of the war drive, inflation, pressure against the labor movement and finally depression or atomic war.

To break out of this impasse, the American labor movement must organize its own political party. Allied with the Negro people and the farmers, the mighty, sixteen-million strong trade union force could write its own platform and put genuine representatives of the working people in office. Having once started down the road of independent political action, nothing could stop American labor from electing a Workers and Farmers Government.

What's Blocking Truce in Korea?

By Art Preis

Arthur Hays Sulzberger, publisher of The New York Times, declared on Aug. 26 that he was "not especially anxious to see a truce reached at Panmunjom." This statement by the chief of the most powerful and influential Big Business newspaper in the country indicates why the truce negotiations in Korea have been stalled so long.

The sensational and revealing declaration of Sulzberger — a clear intimation that the rulers of this country don't want to end the Korean war — was completely excluded from the nation's daily press, except for the Times itself. It published this newsworthy statement on page 21 of its Aug. 27 issue, sandwiched in the middle of a story on the convention of the Association for Education in Journalism. The headline read: "Better Reporting Held Modern Need."

Sulzberger was voicing not merely a personal view. He expressed the position of his newspaper which, in turn, is controlled by the Morgan financial interests. These billionaire investment bankers play a dominant role in the international affairs of the United States.

As an exponent of their views, the head of the Times confirms that the U.S. authorities are responsible for holding up an agreement. His statement fits in with the fact that the U.S. negotiators at Panmunjom have demanded the fifth successive week-long recess and the sixth they have invoked within the past two months. The U.S. command has said to the Chinese and North Koreans, in effect, that negotiations have ended until the latter yield to the terms "irrevocably" set down by the White House and Pentagon.

Why isn't Sulzberger "especially anxious" for the Korean war to end? Not for any of the currently alleged reasons, such as "voluntary repatriation" of prisoners of war, which his paper, among others, has been loudly proclaiming since last December as the reason for continuing the slaughter.

"If hostilities ceased there (Korea)," Sulzberger said, "Russia would undoubtedly break out elsewhere and checking the Communists in any other spot in the world would probably be more expensive to us both in lives and in dollars."

We can skip for the moment the truth or falsity of the assertion that "Russia would undoubtedly break out elsewhere." What we are concerned with is the admission that the interests for whom Sulzberger speaks don't want a truce in Korea and that, in fact, they welcome the war in Korea as a less costly arena in which to fight against the rising anti-capitalist forces.

DELIBERATE HOAX

In the light of Sulzberger's admission, it is plain that the U.S.-created issue of "voluntary repatriation" of war prisoners, the big block to a truce agreement, is a deliberate hoax.

Truman again gave sanction to this fraud when he spoke on Aug. 20 about the "compelling humanitarian and moral reasons for the stand which the United Nations negotiators have taken on the repatriation question."

The whole business of "voluntary repatriation" — including the very phrases — is a pure concoction by the U.S. negotiators at Panmunjom. When it was first raised last December and January, it was pointed out by Walter Lippman, top-ranking political columnist of the N. Y. Herald-Tribune, that the Geneva Convention of 1949, signed by the U.S. and fifty-eight other governments, was specifically drafted to prevent in future wars precisely that treatment of POWs which the U.S. is now demanding as a condition for ending the Korean war.

"It is plain that the treaty does not contemplate the problem we now have before us in Korea," wrote Lippman. We were intensely preoccupied with an even more dreadful, though different, experience. This was the prolonged detention by the Russians of the prisoners they had captured and their refusal to return so many of them on the ground that these men preferred to remain in the Communist world."

So, the special Geneva convention, drafted less than a year before the outbreak of the Korean war, was expressly designed to repudiate "voluntary repatriation" when war prisoners held by the Soviet government are involved.

NOT A WORD

In fact, wrote Lippman, "to prevent that sort of thing from happening the Western powers wrote into the treaty, in Article 7, that 'prisoners of war may in

Destroying Korea



Belching clouds of heavy black smoke, the 8-inch guns of a U.S. Navy cruiser blast a town on the east coast of Korea. Some of the greatest destruction and heaviest loss of civilian lives have been caused by the U.S. fleet which has ranged all along the Korean coastline and ceaselessly bombarded cities, towns and villages. In sea warfare, U.S. naval guns have been arrayed against fishing junks.

no circumstances renounce in part or in entirety the rights secured to them by the present convention" and then in Article 118 the treaty says that "prisoners of war shall be released and repatriated without delay after the cessation of active hostilities." There is not a word in the treaty about "voluntary repatriation."

The U.S. government was against the principle of "voluntary repatriation," especially when invoked by the Soviet government. It discovered this principle only when it wanted a pretext — a "moral issue" — for rejecting a truce in the Korean war.

As a matter of fact, the Chinese-North Korean negotiators were so agreeable even on this score that it almost spoiled the U.S. negotiators' game. The former successively agreed to a return, not of the original 170,000 war prisoner's which the U.S. command publicly said it held, but of first 132,000 and then of only 116,000 POWs.

The American negotiators were therefore impelled to demand such outrageous terms that their opponents would not dare to accept them. First, the U.S. rep-

resentatives said they would take a poll of the prisoners on repatriation. The American spokesmen intimated they would come up with a figure close to what the Chinese and North Koreans had agreed to and in this way work out a formula acceptable to both sides.

But, as Col. George W. Hickman, senior UN staff officer at Panmunjom, later admitted: "We came up with a figure so low that they could not accept it." The U.S. officers deliberately faked a figure calculated to prevent a truce.

In April they claimed they took a poll of all 170,000 Chinese and Korean prisoners of war. They said that 100,000 of these had stated — without coercion — that they would "forcibly resist" repatriation to their own countries.

The entire claim about a poll was blown sky-high with the subsequent series of "riots" and massacres among the prisoners on Koje Island. The battles between the prisoners and fully-armed U.S. troops, backed by tanks and flame-throwers, brought out the fact that the U.S. prison-

authorities did not even have the power to take a poll. Thus, the June 8 N. Y. Times conceded that the resistance of the POWs "within the huge Koje compounds . . . hampered and in some cases entirely blocked UN efforts to question prisoners about whether or not they wanted to be repatriated to Communist territory." The Aug. 11 New Republic, which attempts a defense of the "voluntary repatriation" fraud, nevertheless admits: "It has since become clear that the original 'screening operation' was poorly executed. UN interrogators, unable to enter many compounds, had to make rough guesses. Their calculations were slipshod. . ."

Time magazine, on June 2, said, "Worst of all, observers were beginning to realize that the prisoner vote on repatriation . . . had not been arrived at by the UN in a true and careful polling, but was in some cases a rough and ready guess. . . In presenting the figures as if every prisoner had been specifically consulted, the UN made a serious mistake."

It was no mistake, however. The results of that alleged poll — a patent falsification — are being used today, more than four months later, as the excuse for rejecting a truce in Korea. It is quite clear, as Sulzberger has revealed, that American imperialism is "not especially anxious to see a truce reached at Panmunjom." But not precisely for the reason given by Sulzberger, who is careful not to give the whole truth away.

What is "our program" that

has prevented the capitalist depression that "Stalin wants"? It is the armaments and world war program. The greatest stimulus to that program has been the Korean war. That is what 8th Army General Van Fleet meant when he proclaimed last January: "Korea has been a blessing."

Indeed, it has been a blessing to the Big Brass who have secured out of the Korean events a tremendously expanded Army, Air Force and Navy. It has been a blessing to the big corporations, which have secured tens of billions of dollars extra in war contracts as well as free-of-charge new plants.

"SIMMERING WAR"

Last Jan. 18 the U.S. News and World Report forecast that "war, not peace, is the program for Korea" and said that the Washington politicians and the Pentagon wanted to continue a "simmering war," with "casualties running along 'at a rate of around 300 a week' — at which 'low' cost 'this country is able to train half a million men at a time under combat conditions.'"

But the Korean war is "simmering" now at a far higher rate of U.S. casualties. On Aug. 20, the weekly total of battle casualties in Korea was announced at 688. On Aug. 27, it went up to 879. And so long as the war continues in Korea, there is the gravest danger that it will break out full scale any day and even be expanded into a direct U.S. assault on China, and then a world war.

Long before Sulzberger made his admission, it was apparent that the U.S. rulers were delaying a truce. They have no intention of ending the Korean war. The war can be ended by the action of the American people in demanding and forcing the withdrawal of all U.S. armed forces from Korea.

KOREA, ARMS RACE, SHAKE CCF RANKS

By Peter Farnsworth

TORONTO, Canada — The 12th national convention of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation (CCF), held here recently, was a far cry from the party's 1950 Vancouver convention. Two years of

the Liberal government's intervention in the Korean civil war, mounting doubts as to the "defensive" purpose of the increasing militarization of this country, have shaken the ranks of this mass labor-farmer movement. Even the conservative-minded Coldwell leadership of the party has been compelled to hesitate in its mad policy of supporting the Canadian government's participation in Wall Street's war drive.

At the 1950 convention the leadership hammered through a resolution granting it authority to re-write the party's founding program in line with M. J. Coldwell's dictum that "the class struggle is dead" and his urgings that the St. Laurent government send Canadian troops into the Korean blood bath. This year the leadership came to Toronto with its proposed re-draft already rejected by three provincial sections of the party, two of them the biggest — Saskatchewan and British Columbia. The re-draft was tactfully withdrawn until the 1954 convention.

A great many of the 160 resolutions from constituency clubs and provincial and national bodies, did not come up before the delegates. Sixty-eight resolutions dealt with world affairs, testifying to the membership's awareness that the future of the Canadian people, and indeed of the world, hinges on the issue of war or peace.

ASK VOTE FOR GERMANS ON REARMAMENT

The convention unanimously and without debate backed a resolution of the British Columbia provincial council demanding a vote by the German people on rearmament, and insisting that every effort be made to unify Germany — with no further moves toward the ratification of the Bonn Treaty until such a vote is taken.

The resolutions committee, side-stepping sharply critical resolutions on the United Nations from constituency clubs, presented a six-point resolution which admonished here and there but ended up by backing this front organization of the Western powers.

Saskatchewan's Premier Douglas urged that Canada threaten to withdraw her forces from Korea should the U.S. again take independent action there. He characterized the appointment of a British general to the U.S. Supreme Commander in Korea as a "thinly disguised attempt to bamboozle the public."

Peter Makaroff of the 38-man

Saskatchewan delegation attempted to amend the resolution. He urged the convention to go on record condemning the "provocative character of the so-called global defense program of the United States. His amendment was defeated by a three-to-one show of hands with a considerable number of delegates abstaining.

The never-materialized economic aid program with which the Western Bloc is attempting to sugar-coat its imperialist aims in the East has been grabbed up by broad layers of the movement as good coin and as a great humanitarian cause. A demand that the promises be fulfilled was used by the leadership to justify the colossal rearmament drive, including Canada's \$5 billion expenditure on implements of war. A considerable block of delegates protested and voted for the deletion of this whitewashing insert.

URGE RECOGNITION OF NEW CHINA

The resolution urging immediate recognition of New China added a rider that China should be accepted into the UN only after peace has been established in Korea. Saskatchewan delegate Mahood along with other Saskatchewan delegates urged that the proviso be struck out and that China be accepted into the UN at once. As the debate unfolded, Coldwell himself intervened, successfully defeating the amendment by an approximate 80 to 30 hand vote.

While the increasing sharpness of the international class struggle is having its leveling effects on the ranks of this organized expression of the Canadian working people, shunting it as a whole in the direction of taking a stand against Wall Street's war drive, the leadership is playing a conservative role — moving, falteringly, only under compulsion.

The bulk of the delegates failed to express the increasingly critical opinions of the membership as revealed in the resolutions. Those delegates representing forces that see more clearly the tasks confronting the Canadian working class in their struggle for a socialist Canada in a socialist world, failed to co-ordinate their efforts, failed to weld themselves into an effective fighting force in order to bring their views before the party. If this convention has brought the socialist wing to a clearer realization of this need, and it certainly should have, then it can be marked up as a successful one for the future development of the CCF.

Letters from Our Readers

Mother Appeals For Aid to Son In Draft Case

Editor: Someone sent me a copy of The Militant. It is TOPS! I enclose \$1 for a six-month subscription.

I wish I had heard Mr. Farrell Dobbs' radio speech. We do not have television. Can you send me an extra copy of the Aug. 1 issue, as I'm sending this copy down to our lawyer, Mr. Farmer, who happens to be THE one lawyer in America who still believes in our Constitution and PEACE.

Please read the enclosed leaflets regarding our son's case. He refused to join up with Murder, Inc., the "slaughter-house" political fakery sanctioned by the undemocratic Legion and the hypocritical preachers.

Will you please print these leaflets in The Militant? We are trying to get our case publicized, but the "iron curtain" press and radio system silences all people who dare to do their own thinking, it seems. This "iron curtain" even silenced the fact that Gen. Herbert C. Holdridge was a Presidential candidate. What a contemptible hoax the word LIBERTY has become in America.

Oh, how I wish you would print the full addresses of writers in your public forum page, as it is the ONLY way we, the people, can get together.

If you print this letter, please print my full address.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Harvey Sydow,
Lyons, Nebraska

Editor's Note: We welcome courageous Mrs. Sydow to the ranks of our readers. It is our general policy, unless the letter-writer indicates otherwise, not to publish names and address in full, as a protection to the writer from possible witch-hunt persecution.

We wish to draw the readers' attention to the case of Mrs. Sydow's son, Stanley, aged 22, who is to be tried in Federal court this fall for his refusal as a conscientious objector to report for induction into the U.S. military forces.

Although we oppose capitalist war as revolutionary socialism and not as pacifists, and do not advocate individual refusal to obey the conscription laws, we nevertheless defend all victims of capitalist law and the rights of conscientious objectors.

We would like to quote a very interesting part of Stanley's defense as stated in one of the leaflets Mrs. Sydow so kindly sent.

"He is standing on his right under International Law to refuse participation in war. So far this is the first case in which a registrant relies on International Law to upset peacetime conscription."

"The International Law on which Sydow bases his defense was enforced for the first time by the International Military Tribunal at Nuremberg when the German war criminals of World War II were punished. It was enforced again when the Tokyo Tribunal punished the Japanese war leaders."

"Justice Robert H. Jackson of the U.S. Supreme Court took the principal part in writing the law at Nuremberg. The important principles declared for the first time in 1945 are:

"1. Planning and preparing war in violation of international treaties and agreements is a crime.

"2. Governments do not commit the crime, but individuals are guilty.

"3. It makes no difference whether the individual is the head of the government or only a private citizen. If he participates in planning and preparing war as a leader, organizer, instigator, or merely as an accomplice, he is subject to being punished.

"4. No man can excuse himself by pleading that the laws of his national government compel him to do what he did.

"These principles are very broad and make war just as illegal as murder is, under the

laws of the nation. Whether killing is retail or wholesale, it is now unlawful. . .

"It results that all the laws passed by the Congress for war-making since the end of World War II violate International Law and no citizen can be lawfully compelled to obey them. This means that war is no longer a lawful enterprise."

The appeal then makes the point that Stanley Sydow and his parents are peaceful law-abiding citizens who propose to obey "just and constitutional laws." But "they will not submit to being coerced by the President and Congress into becoming war criminals under international law."

The Sydow family calls for material and moral support "by all people in whom the moral sentiment and respect for law and the principles of the Christian religion has not been snuffed out."

Offers Suggestions To Improve Paper

Editor: Enclosed find \$2 for one year's subscription to your paper. I'm not in favor of your long uninteresting articles on the 3rd International, etc. I believe you would get more support if you would write short to-the-point facts on social security, pensions,

vacations with pay, profits, health security, greater benefits for workers, a Commonwealth or Peoples Party, and sponsor a Transportation Workers of America organization taking in all bus, railroad, plane and ship workers.

Publish a folder (I'd pay 50c. for one) giving the correct vote record of all congressmen in the 82nd Congress, how they voted on all important issues such as for or against Peace, tax increases, etc. Publish a list of reactionary and progressive congressmen, their length of service in Congress, the facts about their salaries, pensions, expenses, etc. Publish an article on benefits to the public and workers if we had government ownership of railroads and reply to the critics who say it could be used as a political football.

Can you investigate and find out who are behind the blocking of benefits in a Seamen's Bill of Rights for all ex-merchant mariners in World War I and II?

C. J. H.
Kansas City

Editor's Note: We do not have the big research and secretarial staffs of the capitalist press and depend on our readers to help us expose the crimes of Big Business and their political machines; but we do try to present from time to time information of the type C. J. H. seeks. We thank him for his good suggestions.

EASTERN EUROPE SINCE 1950

By Ernest Germain

Bi-Partisan Campaign George Clarke
How Many Capitalists? Harry Frankel
Neo-Fascism in Italy Livio Maitan
French Stalinism Pierre Frank
Chinese Revolution

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

July-August

25 Cents

Campaign for
Socialism
Sell 'The Militant'

Middle Class Dilemma

By Jean Blake

A friend of mine, the head of a civil rights organization in a major industrial city, has a problem that is bothering him a great deal, he confessed the other day. He would welcome some sound advice to provide a way out of the dilemma in which he finds himself.

Together with the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and with the Negro press and Negro leaders throughout the country, he has urged, demanded, and threatened the Democratic and Republican parties for four years. He, like they, lobbied for FEPC legislation, anti-poll-tax, anti-lynching, and other civil rights legislation. He, like they, warned the politicians that their records would be remembered in 1952.

Before the Democratic and Republican conventions this year, my friend, like the other Negro leaders, practically issued an ultimatum to the two old parties as to what must be included in their civil rights plank. At the same time, he joined with the other leaders of the Negro and labor movements in a big vote registration drive.

After the capitalist party conventions, my friend condemned the "sell-out" of the Negro voters by both parties in both the platforms and the candidates they selected.

Many Negro leaders, like the official labor leaders, have quickly adapted themselves, "practical" men that they are. They are whitewashing the record and the candidates, and jumping on the bandwagon.

Not so with my liberal friend. He has a conscience and a slightly larger dose of honesty. Also, his executive board has both Democrats and Republicans on it. He thought Adam Clayton Powell said what needed saying when he raised the threat of a boycott of both parties by Negro voters. And he observed with contempt, "I see Adam's back in the fold," when Powell got back on the donkey.

So here's my friend's dilemma, as he puts it: "What am I going to do? I can't honestly urge Negroes to vote for either candidate for President. At the same time, we've been conducting all kinds of campaigns urging them to register and vote. But what can they vote for? — I can't even urge them to vote for the Socialist Workers Party because your party isn't on the ballot in this state. And if they write-in Farrell Dobbs and Myra Tanner Weiss their ballots won't be counted.

"I can't advocate support of Dobbs and Weiss

myself — it would isolate me and end whatever effectiveness I have now. In my present position I'm at least able to prevent either the Democrats or Republicans from taking over our civil rights organization and converting it into an appendage of their party. I'm also able to moderate the policies of the colored Democratic and Republican politicians to some extent. But that is only so long as I remain neutral."

My friend's dilemma is not just his personal dilemma, although there are some particular aspects of it that may be personal. His problem is just an expression of the contradictory position of the middle class as it manifests itself in the field of the Negro struggle. There is no solution for it, because there is a very shaky present.

All they have is a very shaky present. There is no future for the middle class because problems and evils with which it must cope are the result of capitalist development, of capitalist society. Our society has reached the bankrupt stage, with the United States acting as receiver for all the other capitalist powers. But the receiver itself is having trouble. The capitalist class, and its government, has the problem of maintaining its profits and cutting the standard of living of the working class to pay for the huge war machine needed by the ruling class to protect its power and privileges on a world scale.

This means that the age of substantial democratic reforms, concessions to the working class and minority groups, extension of democratic rights for the masses, is just about over.

My liberal friend, and others like him, are going to solve their dilemma only by recognizing the historical stage we have reached, and taking sides. If they are honest, and if they want to follow a consistent policy, they will have to take sides either with those trying to maintain the status quo, slightly modified or not; or with those who see the need for a fundamental, radical change.

There is no "middle way," unfortunately for the middle class. They must choose between capitalism and socialism. My friend may be able to maintain his neutral position between the Democrats and Republicans for a while, but if he votes, as he is exhorting others to do, he will have to "get back in the fold" like Adam Clayton Powell, or make a real break: write-in the names of the Socialist Workers Party candidates and help educate for a revolutionary transformation of our society.

An Honest Democrat

By Fred Perry

So much graft and corruption have been exposed in both the Democratic and Republican parties that most Americans are a bit disillusioned about ever finding another honest politician in either of them. But don't lose heart — one has been located in Flint, Mich.

Recently, a prominent Democratic politician in this industrial city was asked to add his signature to a statement condemning the Trucks Act. The statement is being circulated by the Citizens Committee Against the Trucks Law which was recently formed by people prominent in the Michigan labor movement and which has been joined by professional people and liberals of diverse political beliefs. Its membership agrees on one point — opposition to the reactionary, "thought-control" Trucks Act.

"Oh, yes," said this supposedly pro-labor, pro-liberal politician, "I'm in complete agreement with you that the law is entirely unconstitutional. It is leading us toward a police state. This sort of thing will be the death of democracy in America. But," he added with a forthrightness not usually associated with his profession, "I'm going to be very honest with you. I'm not going to sign it because I'm too much of a coward."

He admitted that "most of the names on this list seem to be solid respectable citizens, all right. But there may be a couple of radicals on the list, too, and my political opponents would use that against me. They wouldn't quote the

whole list — just the one or two questionable characters on it." Then he added with a roguish grin, "You know, I've done a little of that myself."

"No, I've got a pretty good standard of living and a certain position in the community to maintain, and I want to get ahead in politics. I'm sorry, but I haven't got the courage to sign something I believe in wholeheartedly."

Knowing that the circulator of the statement would not divulge his name, our liberal Democrat rambled on, revealing in the unaccustomed luxury of honest speech. When told that Genora Dollinger, Flint Chairman of the Socialist Workers Party, had mentioned him as probably in favor of defending civil rights and as one of those likely to be jailed if the Trucks Act is fully enforced, he said admiringly: "Genora Dollinger! I grew up with her. A finer woman never walked the face of the earth — but I'm afraid that she's going to have to wait until she gets to heaven to get her reward!"

"I can certainly respect her devotion to principles. She's carried the torch around here for years — but, you know, she's never done herself a bit of good. I can admire that kind of courage and devotion to principle, but I want my reward to be something a little more material than people's respect."

Cheer up, fellow citizens. With such honesty among our leaders what have we to worry about?

Notes from the News

"WHAT ARE WE THE PEOPLE going to do in the game of trying to make both end meet?" asks the United Mine Workers Journal in a Labor Day editorial. "We know from experience that we cannot look to the Administration to accomplish the feat for us," says the Journal. "Already, spokesmen for the Administration — Stabilizer Roger L. Putnam and Secretary of Commerce Sawyer — have thrown in the towel." This is a good point, and leads directly to the conclusion that labor should organize its own party, but the Journal unfortunately stops, offering no answer at all.

FARMERS GOT 51 CENTS of every consumer food dollar a year-and-a-half ago, but now they only get 48 cents, the Farmers Union Herald reports. Food prices are higher, but the farmer gets less than ever. The growing difference in the middle went to swell the profits of canners, packers, processors, food brokers, and other capitalists of the food industry.

A UNITED STATES DELEGATE to the sixth United Nations General Assembly, Dr. Channing Tobias, told the annual conference of the Urban League on Sept. 3 that the civil rights platforms of both major parties boil down to "eloquently stated general principles, carefully planned omissions and with such ambiguity as to mean all things to all men." He charged that this stemmed from the view of both parties that the civil rights issue will work itself out "through processes of gradualism." Dr. Tobias should examine the Socialist Workers Party plank on civil rights in the present election.

THE HUE AND CRY AGAINST the State Department policy of refusing to grant passports to people it doesn't like has forced the creation of a Board of Passport Appeals. If this Board is anything like all the other "loyalty" review boards, it might just as well have stayed uncreated. It will not dispense justice. Anyway, all those who value the basic traditional freedoms want to know why there need be any Board or any passport denial at all. Is the State Department creating an Iron Curtain?

USING SHOES AS WEAPONS, angry Brazilian housewives in the state of Minas Geraes of Brazil have taken over leadership of a railroad strike. The women marched on the local railroad station and workshops, routed the police guards with blows from their clubbed footwear, and occupied

the premises. The strikers' wives are also reported to have lain across the tracks to force trains to halt, driven the crews from locomotives and then dumped the fireboxes. The wives took matters into their own hands in the strike for more pay to meet the rapidly mounting cost of living after the chief of police had persuaded the strikers to return to work.

A DIRTY JOB IS BEING attempted by the top leadership of the British trade unions. The General Council of the Trades Union Congress is trying, at the Margate meeting of the Congress, to convince the British workers to forego wage increases. "However," N. Y. Times correspondent Michael Hoffman reports on Sept. 2, "unions representing two-thirds of the constituents of this congress are demanding or are in the process of winning higher wages for their members. . . . The tone of resolutions before this congress indicates quite clearly that the top union leadership is under tremendous pressure from the rank and file to kick over the traces altogether and throw labor's weight not only against wage restraint but against other aspects of British policy that involve or appear to involve continued sacrifices for national strength and sovereignty."

BIGGEST LANDLORD OF THE nation is the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., which rents to over 36,000 families. It also holds mortgages on 184,000 homes which house over a million people. It owns about \$5 billion of American business property. However, the Metropolitan has almost \$11 billion to keep invested and it is having a great deal of trouble doing it. This is a problem not only for the Metropolitan, but for all the other 600-odd insurance companies that are raking in the premiums in the U.S.

TWO MEN WERE SENTENCED to a year in prison and fined \$50 each in Maryland last month for stealing 23 ears of corn valued at \$2. Both pleaded guilty, according to the Baltimore Sun of Aug. 19 and sentences were imposed at once. You guessed it: both of the unfortunate victims of Southern Jim-Crow justice are Negroes.

LABOR'S LEAGUE FOR POLITICAL Education, the AFL counterpart of the CIO Political Action Committee, is having trouble raising money. With 76 AFL internationals participating, the LLPE fund now amounts to less than 1½ cents per AFL member. This reflects the difficulty of raising money among union members for the purpose of helping to elect their Democratic and Republican enemies to office.

VOLUME XVI

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 1952

NUMBER 36

Scab Goes Nowhere Fast



In recent Pittsburgh public transportation strike, pickets halted trolley cars. Striking AFL drivers are shown blocking Pittsburgh Railways Co. trolley after scab ignored picketline at car barn.

CLARKE ON PHILA. RADIO DEBATES MAJOR ISSUES

PHILADELPHIA, Aug. 30 — "The only way to reverse the drive toward World War III is to bring the troops home from Korea, Germany and the far-flung U.S. military bases around the world," George Clarke, Campaign Manager of the Socialist Workers Party, declared over radio station WPEN today. "This is the first point in the Socialist Workers Party election platform."

Clarke explained and defended the SWP platform for the major part of the three-hour broadcast on the Steve Allison show. His opponent, Dr. John Powell, author and educator, was forced to shift his ground repeatedly trying to defend capitalism. A self-styled "McKinley Democrat" and liberal, who kept his roots close to his native Iowa, Powell found it difficult to make out a plausible case for the capitalism of 1952.

When Clarke proposed to him directly, "Let's make a pact

against the Smith Act," Powell hurriedly answered, "Wait a moment, let's discuss it a bit first." As quickly as he could he shifted the topic.

The radio audience as well as the large group at the studio forum submitted questions to both speakers, but the volume of questions and the intensity of the discussion did not permit the speakers to answer all of them.

The program was scheduled as a result of the interest raised by a previous program where the SWP platform was presented.

These broadcasts have served to introduce the viewpoint of socialism to a new layer of thinking workers in the Philadelphia area.

Since U.S. intervention in Korea, the price of meat has gone up 2.6%, dairy products, 4.8%, cereal and bakery products, 4.9%, and fresh fruits and vegetables, 28.5%, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Rubber Local 5 Ratifies Goodrich Strike Settlement

AKRON, Aug. 29 — After a 12-day strike, CIO Rubber Workers Local 5 at the Akron Goodrich firm today ratified a strike settlement which included a new clause granting the company the right to "discipline" workers who engage in an "illegal work stoppage."

In addition the company can sue the union for any strikes "aided and supported" by the top officers of the union or "division chairmen, assistant division chairmen or secretary of a division." (The latter two union representatives work in the plants at all times. There are six divisions in the Akron plants).

The ratification meeting today had an attendance of 1,500 or more and the settlement was approved by a large majority hand vote.

In the discussion, former Vice President Childers called for rejection of the settlement. He said that the new liability clause would "surely" be used against the union, "for wildcats will remain with us" (even though he "was opposed to them"). Under the new agreement Childers pointed out, an assistant chairman or secretary of a division would have to remember to rush to work during a wildcat in their division, or else the union could be held "libelous."

A number of speakers from the floor picked up on the idea of making the foremen "equally libelous" if they "provoked a wildcat." Behind this sentiment was a defense of wildcat strikes, a not very popular cause at the moment.

In reporting for the negotiating committee, President Oldham spoke of the need of "conserving energy" for "a good strike" if necessary when the contract expires. (The new contract is to run for two years, when ratified). He frowned upon wildcats and assailed the militant mass activities of the past spring in support of the office workers' strike.

The settlement includes a number of fringe "advances" of small dimensions plus 10 cents an hour granted other rubber union locals in Akron recently.

Attorney General McGranery announced Sept. that the Justice Department plans to accelerate still further its drive against "communists." A new unit of witch-hunters will specialize in following up FBI "reports" and will use professional stoolpigeons to get "evidence."

Stevenson Double-Talks On Taft-Hartley Issue

(Continued from page 1)

Besides, the President proposes, but Congress disposes. The Taft-Hartley Act was adopted by a vote not only of a majority of Republicans, but a majority of the Democrats in Congress. A majority of Democrats in the House voted only recently for a bill to require Truman to use the Taft-Hartley law on the steel workers.

Even if Stevenson were sincere in wanting repeal, his own political colleagues are not likely to go along. But Stevenson does not propose to repeal the principles of the Taft-Hartley Act, only its "political symbolism" — its name. He wants merely to hide the bitter flavor of the pill by sugar-coating it.

WOULD APPLY T-H ACT

Remembering what happened to the even stronger promise of Truman and the Democrats in '48, we can assume that Stevenson hasn't the faintest intention to wage a real fight around the Taft-Hartley issue. The realistic question to ask Stevenson is: Does he intend to apply the Taft-Hartley Act if elected?

I note that Stevenson refers in his speech to the fact that the Taft-Hartley "remedy" has been administered now nine times. He is speaking here of strike-breaking injunctions used by his colleague Truman, although he carefully avoids mentioning Truman's name. Why didn't Stevenson give labor an unambiguous

Radio Commentator Says Native Fascists Ordered Him Beaten

NEW YORK, Sept. 5 — Barry Gray, radio and television commentator was slugged and kicked by two unidentified men yesterday on the sidewalk.

He told police that he believed they were professional thugs hired by Nazi elements in the Yorkville area to do a job on him.

A friend who tried to come to his assistance was warned by one of the sluggers, "Get away, you Jew."

Gray has recently reported the revival of fascist activities in the Yorkville area which before the war was a hotbed of Coughlinism and Christian Fronters.

Liberals Give Sparkman A Whitewash Treatment

By Albert Parker

The liberal-labor-Negro apologists for the Democratic ticket are reaching all the way down into their whitewash buckets in a desperate effort to justify their support of Sparkman, whom they did not want nominated in the first place. And one of the things they have dug up there is a new "liberal" movement in the South, which Sparkman is supposed to represent.

Americans for Democratic Action, in its statement endorsing Stevenson and Sparkman, says: "ADA is aware of Senator Sparkman's adverse civil rights voting record." But it proceeds to discount this immediately by adding: "We recognize him, however, as a standard bearer of the emerging liberal movement in the New South."

The ADA says nothing further about this new "liberal" movement, when it began to emerge, whom it represents, or exactly what its program is. However the New Republic (Aug. 18) in an editorial entitled "John Sparkman and the Civil Rights Issue" undertakes to fill in what the ADA leaves out.

THE NEW "LIBERALISM"

The newly-discovered Southern liberal movement, according to the New Republic, stands for raising "the economic status of all low-income groups and so to provide better opportunity for all, including the Southern Negro, and Sparkman is one of its 'finest spokesmen'."

Sparkman favors crop insurance, rural electrification, soil conservation, extension of social security, federal aid to education, TVA, etc. — that is, "an economic approach to progress in the South."

But why or how this makes Sparkman a liberal of any kind, the New Republic does not say. Most of the worst Southern reactionaries have favored such measures since the beginning of

Dixiecrat Choice



SPARKMAN

the New Deal 20 years ago — including Russell and Bilbo and Rankin. Why Sparkman qualifies as a liberal for this reason and they don't, the New Republic neglects to explain.

Of course Sparkman (like Russell and the other reactionaries) is opposed to civil rights legislation, and votes against federal aid to education when it includes a provision against segregation.

Conceding that Sparkman's civil rights record is bad, the editors of the New Republic say we might as well recognize that the Northern liberal movement has one approach and the Southern liberal movement another. What is to be done — "is one side to prevail without compromise while the other goes into the political wilderness? or is a new approach to be attempted

which bridges and reconciles the two views?"

The New Republic is in favor of a "new approach" to civil rights and so is Stevenson, it says. Truman, it now admits, was good at talking civil rights, but he achieved "no results" in terms of legislation. Stevenson, it assures us, is different:

"His whole approach and temperament leads him not to advocate but to enact. . . . His inclination will be to advance civil rights legislation that can be passed. His choice of Sparkman was ideal from this point of view. But Sparkman represents further Stevenson's faith in the new South and his determination to bring about advances in civil rights through the consent and participation of elected Southern leaders. Federal legislation is directed primarily at the South, and since it must be enacted by a Senate in which Southerners hold the balance of power and enforced by Southern sheriffs, governors, judges and juries, Stevenson's approach may well be the most realistic course."

"PROPER ENDEAVOR"

In fact, there is no maybe about it for the New Republic, for it continues:

"Until the Sparkman-Stevenson slate was nominated, it was logical for all civil rights supporters to stand on the Truman strategy which no elected Southerner can support. Now that the decision has been made to work with the best forces in the South, the proper endeavor becomes to seek a bridge between Northern and Southern liberalism."

Translating all this into non-liberal language, we get the following picture:

A bridge is needed between Northern and Southern liberalism, that is, between civil rights and anti-civil rights. The South won't give in, so the North should, by changing its civil rights program to something that will have the consent and participation of the Dixie politicians — in other words, make it acceptable to the poll-taxers, the white supremacists and others of what the New Republic now calls the "best forces in the South." Then, instead of merely talking about civil rights, as Truman did, we'll have a civil rights program enacted and enforced with the help of the South's "best forces."

A few short months ago the ADA, CIO, AFL and New Republic were sternly warning the Democratic Party not to tolerate any "compromise" with the Southern Democrats on civil rights, and urging it to purge people like Sparkman who violate the platform of their own party. Now they not only are telling their supporters to go out and work for the election of Sparkman, but they are also asking them to "compromise" with him and the other white supremacists on terms acceptable to the worst scum on the national political scene.

That's what is at the bottom of the liberal-labor-Negro support of Stevenson and Sparkman. Beaten by the Dixiecrats at the Democratic convention, confronted with a move to the right inside the Democratic Party, the liberal and labor leaders themselves are capitulating and moving to the right. Instead of fighting the growing conservatism of the party they are allied to, they are accommodating themselves to it, yielding on principles as well as candidates, offering "realistic" theories and rationalizations in defense of it. Instead of seeking an alliance with the exploited workers and farmers of the South, they are trying to drag the workers and farmers outside of the South into an alliance with the "elected Southern leaders" who are handpicked by the exploiters and oppressors of the Southern workers and farmers.

YOUR CHOICE

So if you want a "compromise" on civil rights, a bridge to the Bourbons and a deal with the Dixiecrats, vote for Stevenson and Sparkman.

But if you really believe in civil rights and want to fight for them, then vote for Dobbs and Weiss and the other candidates of the Socialist Workers Party who stand for an uncompromising struggle against Jim Crow and against concessions to Jim Crow, even in a "liberal" form.

New York Election Forum

GEORGE BREITMAN

SWP Candidate for U.S.

Senator from N. J.

Speaks on

Civil Rights and

The Negroes

Fri., Sept. 12, 8 P.M.

116 University Pl.

Chicago Election Meeting

Irving Beinin

SWP Candidate for Congress

2nd District

Sat., Sept. 13, 8:30 P.M.

734 South Wabash