

NY Post Editor Will Speak for Kutcher Feb. 17

By Daniel Roberts

JAN. 25 — The Kutcher Civil Rights Committee today announced plans for a public rally in New York to support the fight waged by James Kutcher, a legless World War II veteran, to regain his government job. The meeting will be held Friday night, Feb. 17. Speakers will include James Kutcher, James Wechsler, crusading editor of the N. Y. Post, and Morris Lushwitz, Secretary-Treasurer of the New York City CIO Council. The meeting place will be the Community Church main auditorium at 45 E. 35th St. (between Park and Madison Ave.) at 8 P. M.

Official Verbatim Text of Kutcher Pension Hearing (See Page Two)

A similar rally will be held in Chicago, Friday, Feb. 10, 8 P. M., at the Hamilton Hotel. Kutcher and Kenneth Douthett, Illinois Division Director of the American Civil Liberties Union, will be featured speakers. Prominent liberal and labor figures are sponsors.

These two meetings will kick off a new drive to restore Kutcher to his Veterans Administration job, from which he was fired as a "loyalty" risk in August 1948, because he openly belongs to the Socialist Workers Party. The SWP has been arbitrarily listed as "subversive" by the Attorney General. Kutcher's case is scheduled to be argued soon

between Park and Madison Ave.) at 8 P. M.

Can't Find Killers



FBI boss J. E. Hoover who attacked Dr. T. R. M. Howard for pointing out the fact that FBI investigators can't seem to solve racist crimes against Negroes. Hoover said, "This Bureau is doing everything within the scope of existing legislation." Dr. Howard replied, "If all had been done that could have been done, then he would produce the killers."

before the Circuit Court of Appeals.

The new drive comes on the heels of Kutcher's victory in a fight to keep his disability pension. The VA had moved just before Christmas to take away his sole income — the compensation for his wartime injury — on which he supports himself and his aging parents. But nationwide public indignation forced the VA to retreat.

For over seven years, James Kutcher has been fighting for his right to hold both his socialist beliefs and a federal job. Following his dismissal, he took his case to the courts and the public. He engaged in two coast-to-coast speaking tours and another tour of the East and Midwest. An imposing array of union, Negro and liberal organizations endorsed his struggle.

Meanwhile, the government witch hunters kept up a steady harassment against the legless veteran. First they forced him to go through the maze of rigged administrative appeals. Then, after the Circuit Court of Appeals ruled in October 1952 that the VA could not dismiss Kutcher solely on the grounds of SWP membership, the VA officials devised new charges based on membership and again denied him his job. Once more they forced Kutcher to go through the jungle of administrative appeals and court litigation.

In addition, a few days before Christmas 1952, the Newark Housing Administration sought to evict Kutcher and his parents from their apartment under terms of the Gwinn Amendment, which denies residence in a housing project to members of an organization on the Attorney General's list.

Although last December Kutcher won a stay of eviction in the N. J. Supreme Court, the Housing Authority is planning new legal moves against him. Then last Christmas, the VA again struck at Kutcher through the unsuccessful move to take away his pension.

Kutcher, the courageous fighter for civil democratic rights, deserves the support of all civil liberties champions. Because of prolonged litigation, his legal struggle is now stripped down to an attack on the constitutionality of the Attorney General's "subversive" list. This list — the basis for the entire administrative witch hunt — is used by government thought-control cops to fire and smear countless individuals.

Support the Kutcher meetings! Mail contributions for the legal fight to the Kutcher Civil Rights Committee, George Weissman Treasurer, 325 E. 17th St., New York 3, N. Y.

Unions Vote \$1 Million To Aid Strike

By Art Sharon

NEW YORK, Jan. 24 — Meeting together yesterday for the first time in twenty years the executive boards of the New York Central Labor Council and New York City CIO Council voted unanimously to come to the aid of the embattled 55,000 Westinghouse strikers. The joint meeting voted to raise \$1,000,000 within thirty days and to immediately collect food for the 11,000 strikers in the metropolitan area.


This action by the two bodies reflects the concern in the labor movement over the union-busting drive by the Westinghouse Corporation. The strike is now one hundred days old and has been marked by a series of savage assaults upon the International Union of Electrical Workers who represent 45,000 of the striking workers and the independent United Electrical Workers who represent the balance. The Westinghouse Corporation has gone all out to recruit scabs and smash the strike.

Formal union and company negotiations sponsored by the Federal Mediation Service had come to a deadlock. In a new plan the Federal mediators brought James Carey, IUE President and Robert D. Blasier, Westinghouse Vice President in charge of labor relations, to get together for secret sessions that went on for nearly two weeks. The full negotiating committees resumed their meetings last Wednesday. In a statement released today Westinghouse President Gwilym A. Price noted that an "improved atmosphere" marked the meetings and that "true collective bargaining" is now under way.

The central strike issues relate to the right of the company to unilaterally decide on speed up, layoff and reclassification of workers. The company is demanding that its union-busting program be tied down in a five-year contract similar to that signed by IUE with General Electric. The present strike was precipitated by the action of the Westinghouse workers in Pittsburgh who rejected the weak GE settlement negotiated by James Carey as a pattern for Westinghouse.

The spirit and morale of the strikers has remained high. More than anything else these fighting men and women deserve the fullest mobilization of the labor movement to show Westinghouse that it cannot carry on its brutal war with impunity.

Westinghouse Strikers Resist Scabs



Westinghouse strikers in Bloomfield, N. J., close ranks as scab-loaded cars attempt to crash picket line. Ten persons were injured in scab attacks here and in Edison, N. J. The strike has been marked by extensive company use of scabberding, police violence, redbaiting and direct government intervention against striking workers.

War or Peace -- Who Will Decide?

An Editorial

Ever since Secretary of State Dulles revealed in the Jan. 16 Life magazine that the Republican Administration took the U.S. to the brink of war three times in the last three years, the Democrats have been demanding a "Great Debate" on foreign policy. While the demand of the Democratic party is prompted solely by desire to capitalize on Dulles' statement for election purposes in 1956, a debate is very much in order.

It would inevitably reveal that the suicidal Dulles policy is genuinely bipartisan. Dictated by the highest Big Business circles, this policy was also carried out by the Democrats, who under Truman, took us over the brink in Korea.

A fundamental question would emerge from the debate — namely: Can the American people afford to leave war-making powers in the hands of capitalist politicians and brass hats dancing to Wall Street's tune?

During last summer's period of "Geneva smiles," the President and numerous other high government and military figures admitted that in the present age of nuclear weapons a major war can well result in total destruction. How is the danger of such destruction to be avoided?

It has been argued that the answer to the life-and-death question lies in curbing the war-making powers of the executive branch of the government and restricting the decision of war or peace to Congress. But the record shows that this has not kept the country out of war.

The executive — in clear violation of the Constitution — has certainly usurped powers that are supposed to be lodged in Congress. But the sober fact is that Congress is composed of capitalist politicians who, on all fundamentals, support the Big Business war policy of the executive.

That is why, in each period of crisis, Congress has abdicated this power to the executive. For instance, Truman illegally assumed the responsibility for hurling American troops into Korea. Instead of calling him to order, Congress quickly raised its hand in approval.

Peace or world destruction — a decision of such scope cannot be left in the hands of defenders of the profit system whose intention is either to rule or destroy the world.

The nuclear age is certainly one of great changes. The simple logic of self-preservation dictates one of the major changes that must be made. The people, themselves, must have the sole, direct power to decide the question of war or peace.

The establishment of a national referendum on war is more urgently needed than ever before.

NAACP Takes Step to Organize Civil Rights Rally

Language Issue Is Part of Class Struggle in India

By William Bundy

Jan. 24 — The largest and most militant mass demonstrations and general strikes in India's recent history shook the country from Bombay to Calcutta last week. The U. S. capitalist press attempted to explain away this turbulent social movement as resulting from obscure linguistic antagonisms rooted in the "mysterious" nature of the Indian people, or a "Communist plot," or a combination of both. Actually the strikes and demonstrations are manifestations of sharp class battles between the Indian capitalists and the workers, marking a new stage in the political awakening of the Indian working class.

The demonstrations protesting Nehru's gerrymandering of the political map of India, began Jan. 15 in the workers' districts of Bombay. They lasted for more than a week and spread across the sub-continent to the states of Bengal, Orissa and Bihar. In Bombay, a reported 15,000 police were unable to control the crowds. More than 1,400 people were jailed and about 500 are estimated to have been killed in the street fighting, including many policemen.

CLASS INTERESTS

The New York Times Jan. 20 admitted that underlying the so-called language issue are basic class interests: "The Maharatti-speaking people, called Maharashtrians who form the bulk of Bombay's labor force, demanded a state of their own with Bombay as its capital. But the Gujarati peoples, who control the city's commercial and business life, claimed Bombay for their proposed state . . . (the demonstration developed power from the strike in) the textile mills where hundreds of thousands of Maharashtrians earn their 40 or 50 cents a day. That filled the streets with men with time on their hands and political and social bitterness on their minds."

The absurdity of the "Communist plot" charge is revealed by the fact that all reports admit the demonstrations were supported by the overwhelming majority of the workers in Bombay. In addition Sharokh Sabavala reported in the Jan. 20 Christian Science Monitor: "The alerted local administration had arrested all Communist leaders here 12 hours before Prime Minister Nehru told the nation that disagreement over Bombay's future had forced New Delhi to take over the city's administration." That is, long before the announcement which precipitated the demonstrations was made, the "plotters" were in jail.

The real cause of the violent (Continued on page 4)

Michigan UAW Locals Call for Union Support To D.C. Mobilization

By George Lavan

NEW YORK, Jan. 25 — After prolonged delay, plans appear to be getting under way to launch the long-heralded Civil Rights Mobilization in Washington, D. C. in Grand Rapids a conference Jan. 20-22 of Michigan locals of the United Auto Workers called for mass labor participation in the mobilization which will be sponsored by the AFL-CIO, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and 49 other national organizations.

At its 47th Annual Meeting, earlier this month, the NAACP finally broke its silence on the civil rights mobilization. Executive secretary Roy Wilkins, after describing the reign of terror in Mississippi and the need for Congress to do something about it, announced that the civil rights rally would take place in Washington at "an early date."

At the Michigan UAW conference the 600 delegates were given to understand that the trek to the capital would be called for the end of February or the first part of March. The Washington mobilization was originally pointed to by CIO President Walter Reuther last October. In a letter to all Auto Workers locals on the TIL case he said such a mobilization would be held "early next year." Again on Nov. 11, when anger ran high over the refusal of a Mississippi grand jury even to indict lynchers

REASON FOR SILENCE

After that nothing but months of silence came from top labor and Negro circles about the mobilization. Speculation was that sections of the leadership feared a mobilization might get out of hand and become a mass March on Washington, which would greatly embarrass or possibly force a break between the labor and Negro voters and the Northern Democratic leaders who have taken a pledge not to get tough with the Southern wing of their party.

This silence made the Pittsburgh Courier's demand for the sending of federal troops to Mississippi ring all the louder. This was also true of the proposal raised by Mississippi Negro leader Theodore R. M. Howard for a March on Washington by a million people.

Whether the belated announcement (Continued on page 4)

\$42.4 Billion for War Sets Peacetime Record

By Fred Hart

Two-thirds of the money spent by the federal government in the fiscal year beginning next July will be for war preparation. Another 11% will go directly to the banks, insurance companies and corporations in the form of interest payments on the national debt. The total expenditure will be \$65.9 billion, including \$42.4 billion for "national security" and military "foreign aid," \$7.1 billion (more than the entire national budget in 1935) for interest on debt,

and about \$15 billion for all the other expenses of government combined.

In presenting the budget to Congress on Jan. 16, President Eisenhower stated "budget revenues now permit us to undertake some new and expanded programs for enhancing opportunities for human well-being and economic growth. This budget reflects that purpose."

It is true that the budget is expanded by \$1.6 billion over the present fiscal year, and the capitalist press tries to make it ap-

pear that this is a result of increased social welfare funds. The figures reveal, however, that the lion's share of the increase, one billion dollars, is for the military, while the welfare and labor departments get only a \$200 million increase — not even enough to keep pace with the yearly population growth.

The real purposes of the capitalist government are reflected in the fact that expenditures for weapons of mass destruction have increased heavily over previous years. Money spent on guided missiles will be \$1.276 billion, double what it is this year, while the entire amount for public health and education combined will be only \$835 million.

In 1939 U.S. economy had a military budget of \$1.25 billion. War expenditures soared to \$75 billion in 1948. That was when a recession began. The Korean war budgets of 1952 and 1953 brought military spending up to \$45.9 billion and \$52.5 billion respectively. The peacetime years since then have all run over \$40 billion. The proposed 1957 budget's \$42.4 billion is a new peacetime high. It dwarfs the \$28 billion that is to be spent for capital expansion this year which the Big Business magazines have been hailing as the major factor in the boom.

A military budget that makes war production by far the nation's major industry and consumes over 10% of the gross national product even in peacetime has become a permanent feature of the national economy — as permanent as capitalism, that is.

Westinghouse Strike Is Solid in Buffalo

By Charles Seaman

BUFFALO, Jan. 20 — The eyes of the Buffalo labor movement are on the AFL-CIO to see what it will do about the Westinghouse strike. At a recent UAW union meeting a worker took the floor and said, "We know what it is to be tied down to a five-year contract. What are we doing for the Westinghouse workers?" The International representative replied, "Recently a \$100 Plate Dinner was held under the joint sponsorship of the AFL and CIO and over \$35,000 was taken in." He also reported that the union, along with many other Niagara Frontier locals, had made large donations to the strike.

At a United Steelworkers local meeting a member stated, "Our contract runs out in June. If the guys don't win this strike out in

Westinghouse, we're going to be in for a rough summer ourselves." The membership of the local voted a \$2,500 donation to the Westinghouse strikers.

SELL YOUR "ASSETS"

The 3,400 members of Local 1581 of the International Union of Electrical Workers, AFL-CIO, now in the fourteenth week of strike, are conducting a magnificent struggle against the Westinghouse Corporation. They need all the aid they can get. The strikers have reported how difficult it is to get aid from the Erie County Welfare Department. They are told by social service workers to use up all their "assets" including borrowing on insurance policies. They are told to turn in their automobile license plates. But hardship has not weakened the splendid militancy of the local members who continue to prevent the company from any large-scale

attempts to start back-to-work movements.

Some minor efforts by the

Kutcher Will Speak Feb. 5 on WEVD

James Kutcher, legless World War II veteran, fighting to regain the job he lost seven years ago in the federal government's "loyalty" purge, will appear on the Social Democratic Forum on Sunday, Feb. 5 at 9:30 P. M. over N. Y. Station WEVD, 1330 on the dial. Kutcher will be interviewed by Carl Holderman, former head of the New Jersey CIO and now State Commissioner of Labor. He helped form the Kutcher Civil Rights Committee in 1948. John Lyons, a New York union official and Forum director, will be moderator.

company to intimidate workers by sending foremen around to their homes has completely collapsed. The Westinghouse bosses, long known for their vicious strike-breaking tactics, can't break down the morale of Local 1581, but the solid front put up by the workers needs more than financial aid if it is to succeed. They must have the support of all the resources of the labor movement in the Niagara Frontier.

The financially powerful Westinghouse Corporation has thrown all its resources into the battle to crush the strike. It is also watching anxiously what the newly-merged labor movement is going to do.

BUSY WITH SQUABBLE

The AFL and CIO here are busy wrangling among themselves over who shall dominate the organization of the unified AFL-CIO. Briefly, the dispute is

between unions who are presently affiliated with the Buffalo Federation of Labor (AFL) and the Greater Buffalo Industrial Union Council (CIO) over those unions that had left these central bodies or had never joined them.


This power squabble over who will get the largest piece of the newly-merged organization hampers the struggle of the Westinghouse workers. This central body must settle its differences and begin to mobilize Niagara Frontier labor. Westinghouse workers have been out for a long 14 weeks. They must not stand alone any longer.

The Westinghouse strike requires the solidarity and strength of the newly-merged labor movement. An area-wide strike-defense rally, called during working hours, should be labor's reply to the union-busting plot of Big Business.

Racists at Work



A two-to-one majority was engineered in Virginia referendum to use public funds for "private" segregated schools. In picture, Alexandria couple is accosted by Jim Crow electioneers at polling place. Virginia governor met Jan. 24 with governors of Georgia, Miss., and South Carolina to coordinate fight to maintain segregation.



This chart of the estimated 1957 federal budget sent to Congress by Pres. Eisenhower shows that \$65.9 billion will be spent at home and abroad. The budget dollar is sliced like a pie to show where the money comes from and where it goes. The budget lists \$40.4 billion for "national security"; additional military expenditures appear under different headings bringing the real proportion to well over the 61% mark.

Excerpts from Verbatim Text

Official Transcript of Kutcher's VA Hearing

[We conclude publication below of excerpts from the official transcript of James Kutcher's public hearing held on Dec. 30 before the Veterans Administration's Central Committee on Waivers and Forfeitures. A first installment appeared last week. —Ed.]

Mr. Rauh: Mr. Kutcher now has the burden of proof to prove himself, as in my judgment, innocent of treason. The least we can ask for under these circumstances is that the charges be made more specific. We ask first that the charges state the name of the country that Mr. Kutcher is supposed to have aided.

Acting Chairman: I think I can answer that, Mr. Rauh. Communist China and North Korea.

Mr. Rauh: Now will you kindly state any act that he did that is alleged in this document in which he gave aid and assistance to Communist China or North Korea?

Acting Chairman: I can only repeat what we have already written to Mr. Kutcher. Mr. Rauh, I will just simply read this over again, since it appears that you didn't understand it.

Mr. Rauh: I understood it perfectly.

Acting Chairman: . . . "It is further shown that you urged and advocated that the members in attendance at the camp cause

strikes and get in key positions and get the Socialist Workers' Party in control of the Government of the United States."

Now if you are going to cause strikes during time of war, you aid an enemy. That is our view of it.

Mr. Rauh: Are you suggesting really, in public, Mr. Moss, that a man who causes strikes during wartime is guilty of rendering assistance to the enemy? Are you really going to suggest that here?

Acting Chairman: . . . Now that is my personal opinion, that a man who is a member of this Socialist Workers' Party which, if I am not mistaken was sympathetic with the North Koreans, makes such a statement as that in time of war, encouraging people to strike, that is at least a prima facie case of rendering assistance to an enemy of the United States. I am not making any decision. I am saying that that is a prima facie case.

Mr. Rauh: The Socialist Workers' Party opposes the Government of North Korea and of China and the suggestion that there is one bit of evidence in here that has anything to do with North Korea and China is wrong. You have not alleged an act of aid to North Korea and China and you ought to dismiss the indictment if that is what you are calling this thing.

Acting Chairman: I can only repeat what we have already written to Mr. Kutcher. Mr. Rauh, I will just simply read this over again, since it appears that you didn't understand it.

Mr. Rauh: I understood it perfectly.

Acting Chairman: . . . "It is further shown that you urged and advocated that the members in attendance at the camp cause

Reading The Transcript



George Weissman, Treasurer of the Kutcher Civil Rights Committee, and James Kutcher look over the transcript of the Washington, D. C., pension hearing.

this: That that is inconsistent with the information we have as to what you told the students.

Mr. Rauh: By a secret informer that you won't produce face to face with us . . .

Acting Chairman: The Committee has information that following your speech, the meeting was opened to questions and answers, and further that a student asked you, "If there is force and violence used to overthrow the government when the Socialist Workers' Party attempts to take over, whose fault will it be?" You answered, "It won't be our fault if the majority want socialism and the minority don't want it. We aren't responsible for what happens." Did you make that statement?

Mr. Kutcher: Yes.

Acting Chairman: You have indicated in former testimony that your party is opposed to the present government of the Soviets. Is it not true that on April 18, 1949, you addressed a letter to the editor of the Militant, an official publication of the Socialist Workers' Party, stating that although the Socialist Workers' Party had differences with the Communist Party, the Socialist Workers' Party defended the 11 Communist Party members then on trial in New York?

Mr. Rauh: Don't answer that question. I object. I will tell you why I won't let him answer that question, if you are suggesting that it is rendering assistance to an enemy of the United States to have opposed the trial of the 11 Communists, then I say what you are doing is suggesting that many millions of American citizens who themselves opposed convictions under the Smith Act, were guilty of rendering assistance to [an enemy of] the United States, and I won't let him answer that question. I will proudly affirm that millions of Americans opposed the conviction of people for what they said rather than what they did, but I refuse to let him answer that question.

Acting Chairman: Let him know the answer. O. K. Did you write such a letter? Was not the purpose of your defense of the 11 communists prompted by the members of the Socialist Workers' Party to do whatever it could to the damage of our present constitutional government in this country?

Mr. Rauh: I won't let him answer any of those questions because they deal with civil liberties matters which fine Americans, many millions of them, and if you want to accuse the American Civil Liberties Union, if you want to accuse the Congress of Industrial Organizations of helping our enemy because they oppose Smith Act convictions, you may go ahead, but he is not going to answer questions on that subject while he is my client.

Acting Chairman: You are overruled. I will go ahead with the questions . . . You addressed a letter which you gave to the press, to the Chairman of the V. A. Loyalty Board of Philadelphia, in which you stated that you never had denied membership in the Socialist Workers' Party, that you did not deny it then, but that on the contrary you possibly affirmed it. Do you still affirm such membership?

Mr. Kutcher: Yes.

Acting Chairman: You have indicated in former testimony that your party is opposed to the present government of the Soviets. Is it not true that on April 18, 1949, you addressed a letter to the editor of the Militant, an official publication of the Socialist Workers' Party, stating that although the Socialist Workers' Party had differences with the Communist Party, the Socialist Workers' Party defended the 11 Communist Party members then on trial in New York?

Mr. Rauh: Don't answer that question. I object. I will tell you why I won't let him answer that question, if you are suggesting that it is rendering assistance to an enemy of the United States to have opposed the trial of the 11 Communists, then I say what you are doing is suggesting that many millions of American citizens who themselves opposed convictions under the Smith Act, were guilty of rendering assistance to [an enemy of] the United States, and I won't let him answer that question. I will proudly affirm that millions of Americans opposed the conviction of people for what they said rather than what they did, but I refuse to let him answer that question.

Acting Chairman: Let him know the answer. O. K. Did you write such a letter? Was not the purpose of your defense of the 11 communists prompted by the members of the Socialist Workers' Party to do whatever it could to the damage of our present constitutional government in this country?

Mr. Rauh: I won't let him answer any of those questions because they deal with civil liberties matters which fine Americans, many millions of them, and if you want to accuse the American Civil Liberties Union, if you want to accuse the Congress of Industrial Organizations of helping our enemy because they oppose Smith Act convictions, you may go ahead, but he is not going to answer questions on that subject while he is my client.

Acting Chairman: You are overruled. I will go ahead with the questions . . . You addressed a letter which you gave to the press, to the Chairman of the V. A. Loyalty Board of Philadelphia, in which you stated that you never had denied membership in the Socialist Workers' Party, that you did not deny it then, but that on the contrary you possibly affirmed it. Do you still affirm such membership?

Mr. Kutcher: Yes.

Acting Chairman: You have indicated in former testimony that your party is opposed to the present government of the Soviets. Is it not true that on April 18, 1949, you addressed a letter to the editor of the Militant, an official publication of the Socialist Workers' Party, stating that although the Socialist Workers' Party had differences with the Communist Party, the Socialist Workers' Party defended the 11 Communist Party members then on trial in New York?

Mr. Rauh: Don't answer that question. I object. I will tell you why I won't let him answer that question, if you are suggesting that it is rendering assistance to an enemy of the United States to have opposed the trial of the 11 Communists, then I say what you are doing is suggesting that many millions of American citizens who themselves opposed convictions under the Smith Act, were guilty of rendering assistance to [an enemy of] the United States, and I won't let him answer that question. I will proudly affirm that millions of Americans opposed the conviction of people for what they said rather than what they did, but I refuse to let him answer that question.

Acting Chairman: Let him know the answer. O. K. Did you write such a letter? Was not the purpose of your defense of the 11 communists prompted by the members of the Socialist Workers' Party to do whatever it could to the damage of our present constitutional government in this country?

Mr. Rauh: I won't let him answer any of those questions because they deal with civil liberties matters which fine Americans, many millions of them, and if you want to accuse the American Civil Liberties Union, if you want to accuse the Congress of Industrial Organizations of helping our enemy because they oppose Smith Act convictions, you may go ahead, but he is not going to answer questions on that subject while he is my client.

Acting Chairman: You are overruled. I will go ahead with the questions . . . You addressed a letter which you gave to the press, to the Chairman of the V. A. Loyalty Board of Philadelphia, in which you stated that you never had denied membership in the Socialist Workers' Party, that you did not deny it then, but that on the contrary you possibly affirmed it. Do you still affirm such membership?

Mr. Kutcher: Yes.

Acting Chairman: You have indicated in former testimony that your party is opposed to the present government of the Soviets. Is it not true that on April 18, 1949, you addressed a letter to the editor of the Militant, an official publication of the Socialist Workers' Party, stating that although the Socialist Workers' Party had differences with the Communist Party, the Socialist Workers' Party defended the 11 Communist Party members then on trial in New York?

Mr. Rauh: Don't answer that question. I object. I will tell you why I won't let him answer that question, if you are suggesting that it is rendering assistance to an enemy of the United States to have opposed the trial of the 11 Communists, then I say what you are doing is suggesting that many millions of American citizens who themselves opposed convictions under the Smith Act, were guilty of rendering assistance to [an enemy of] the United States, and I won't let him answer that question. I will proudly affirm that millions of Americans opposed the conviction of people for what they said rather than what they did, but I refuse to let him answer that question.

Acting Chairman: Let him know the answer. O. K. Did you write such a letter? Was not the purpose of your defense of the 11 communists prompted by the members of the Socialist Workers' Party to do whatever it could to the damage of our present constitutional government in this country?

Mr. Rauh: I won't let him answer any of those questions because they deal with civil liberties matters which fine Americans, many millions of them, and if you want to accuse the American Civil Liberties Union, if you want to accuse the Congress of Industrial Organizations of helping our enemy because they oppose Smith Act convictions, you may go ahead, but he is not going to answer questions on that subject while he is my client.

Acting Chairman: You are overruled. I will go ahead with the questions . . . You addressed a letter which you gave to the press, to the Chairman of the V. A. Loyalty Board of Philadelphia, in which you stated that you never had denied membership in the Socialist Workers' Party, that you did not deny it then, but that on the contrary you possibly affirmed it. Do you still affirm such membership?

Mr. Kutcher: Yes.

although no evidence has been indicated or has been produced — "guilty of mutiny, treason, sabotage, or rendering assistance to an enemy of the United States or its allies."

Have you ever committed mutiny?

A No, sir.

Q Have you ever committed treason?

A No, sir.

Q Have you ever committed sabotage?

A No, sir.

Q Have you ever knowingly consciously rendered assistance to an enemy of the United States or its allies?

A No, sir.

Q The letter, which was sent to you continues: "The evidence shows that you are and have been an active member of the Socialist Workers' Party since 1938."

Is that true, Mr. Kutcher?

A That is true, yes, sir.

Q It continues: "That the Socialist Workers' Party has been determined to be by duly authorized officials of the United States of America, an organization which seeks to alter the form of government of the United States of America by unconstitutional means."

Is it true that an official of the United States Government made that determination?

A An official made such a determination.

Q Is it correct?

A No, sir.

Q Would it be correct to state, Mr. Kutcher, that these charges, like your statements made in 1950 and '51 are nothing but an unmitigated lie?

A Yes, sir.

Q What, Mr. Kutcher, are your views — your political and economic views — would you give them to this Board briefly?

A I believe that we should have a socialist society with planned production for use instead of profit, that this society come into being through the organization of a labor party, the election of a farmer labor government, and — well, that is about the gist of it.

Q Have those been your views over the last 18 years as a member of the Socialist Workers' Party?

A Yes, sir.

Q Are those also, in your opinion, the views of the Socialist Workers' Party?

A Yes, sir.

Q Does the Party or do you advocate violent overthrow of the Government or the overthrow of the Government by force and violence?

A No, sir.

Q Or the replacement of our form of government by unconstitutional means?

A No, sir.

Q Did you have any relationships or brushes or incidents with members of the Communist Party on your speaking tours in the last few years?

A Yes, I have, and they have been very hostile to my case. In any organization where they had any influence, they tried to sabotage the support. They tried to persuade the organization not to donate funds and so on.

Q In other words, the Communist Party of this country has opposed you in your effort to retain or regain your government job, is that right?

A Yes, sir, although I might say that in the interim they have learned, and now they don't say one thing or the other. They don't say anything one way or the other.

Q Do you have some knowledge about the manner in which the Socialist Workers' Party was listed as subversive by the Attorney General?

A It was listed without a hearing, that is all I know.

Q Has the Socialist Workers' Party ever been given a hearing on the question of its loyalty to the Government?

A No, sir.

Q Is membership in an organization listed by the Attorney General a crime according to the law?

A No, sir.

Q If your pension is denied you, Mr. Kutcher, — and I assume you will have no other means of livelihood or your parents — will you give up your membership in the Socialist Workers' Party?

A No, sir.

Q If your pension is retained, if this Board should decide that you may retain your pension, will you give up your membership in the Socialist Party?

A No, sir.

By Mr. Rauh:

Q Mr. Kutcher, there are just one or two things I would like to clarify. You are accused of rendering aid and assistance to the countries of Communist China and North Korea, so I believe your views on those two countries might be expanded somewhat. Would you mind repeating your testimony in connection with your views and the views of the Socialist Workers' Party on Soviet Russia?

A The Soviet Union we designate as a degenerated workers' state. That is to say the dictatorship in the Soviet Union developed over a period of years, and we have fought against it right from the beginning. As for Communist China and North Korea — North Korea or South Korea — my views essentially are these: that the people there should be left alone to work out their own problems without any outside interference. I might say that if I or any member of my party were to go to the Soviet Union or to Communist China or North Korea, we would be dead.

Mr. Rauh (addressing the committee): . . . Now I am not going to repeat the argument that I don't believe you have the power to do this because it should be in a court of law. I am not going to repeat the argument that no allegation has been made of rendering assistance to an enemy because there

has been no allegation of intent, but I would like to repeat what I said before that in order to find Mr. Kutcher guilty you have got to produce guilt instead of presuming guilt because you didn't produce one witness in this room or one fact against Mr. Kutcher.

The only evidence produced this afternoon has been produced by Mr. Kutcher out of his own mouth and under oath . . .

Mr. Kutcher told you under oath that he had never done these things. You have produced not one iota or witness, not one informer has stood before us to be subjected to cross-examination. You had some secret informer say that he defied the American flag. You heard Mr. Kutcher say he had not defied the American flag. I say you have no choice. You either produce that man who said that about the American flag and let him say it in our face or you must take Mr. Kutcher's testimony at its face value and I say you haven't any evidence in this case against Mr. Kutcher of any form.

There is nothing here but favorable testimony. Mr. Kutcher has said nothing that isn't honorable. I don't happen to believe in socialism, but it is perfectly honorable for Mr. Kutcher to stand here and say he believes in it . . .

I say that the only people who would really suffer if you should deny this pension to Mr. Kutcher are the American people because they will be ashamed of having a Veterans Administration that would take away from this man on this record the thing which Congress gave him.

I know it is late in the year, it is December 30, but I would urge that you give us a decision before the new year. I would urge you don't leave this thing on your conscience and on the American people's conscience for this weekend. It seems to me that there is still time — it is only three o'clock — there is still time for a decision of the Veterans Administration . . .

has been no allegation of intent, but I would like to repeat what I said before that in order to find Mr. Kutcher guilty you have got to produce guilt instead of presuming guilt because you didn't produce one witness in this room or one fact against Mr. Kutcher.

The only evidence produced this afternoon has been produced by Mr. Kutcher out of his own mouth and under oath . . .

Mr. Kutcher told you under oath that he had never done these things. You have produced not one iota or witness, not one informer has stood before us to be subjected to cross-examination. You had some secret informer say that he defied the American flag. You heard Mr. Kutcher say he had not defied the American flag. I say you have no choice. You either produce that man who said that about the American flag and let him say it in our face or you must take Mr. Kutcher's testimony at its face value and I say you haven't any evidence in this case against Mr. Kutcher of any form.

There is nothing here but favorable testimony. Mr. Kutcher has said nothing that isn't honorable. I don't happen to believe in socialism, but it is perfectly honorable for Mr. Kutcher to stand here and say he believes in it . . .

I say that the only people who would really suffer if you should deny this pension to Mr. Kutcher are the American people because they will be ashamed of having a Veterans Administration that would take away from this man on this record the thing which Congress gave him.

I know it is late in the year, it is December 30, but I would urge that you give us a decision before the new year. I would urge you don't leave this thing on your conscience and on the American people's conscience for this weekend. It seems to me that there is still time — it is only three o'clock — there is still time for a decision of the Veterans Administration . . .

has been no allegation of intent, but I would like to repeat what I said before that in order to find Mr. Kutcher guilty you have got to produce guilt instead of presuming guilt because you didn't produce one witness in this room or one fact against Mr. Kutcher.

The only evidence produced this afternoon has been produced by Mr. Kutcher out of his own mouth and under oath . . .

Mr. Kutcher told you under oath that he had never done these things. You have produced not one iota or witness, not one informer has stood before us to be subjected to cross-examination. You had some secret informer say that he defied the American flag. You heard Mr. Kutcher say he had not defied the American flag. I say you have no choice. You either produce that man who said that about the American flag and let him say it in our face or you must take Mr. Kutcher's testimony at its face value and I say you haven't any evidence in this case against Mr. Kutcher of any form.

There is nothing here but favorable testimony. Mr. Kutcher has said nothing that isn't honorable. I don't happen to believe in socialism, but it is perfectly honorable for Mr. Kutcher to stand here and say he believes in it . . .

I say that the only people who would really suffer if you should deny this pension to Mr. Kutcher are the American people because they will be ashamed of having a Veterans Administration that would take away from this man on this record the thing which Congress gave him.

I know it is late in the year, it is December 30, but I would urge that you give us a decision before the new year. I would urge you don't leave this thing on your conscience and on the American people's conscience for this weekend. It seems to me that there is still time — it is only three o'clock — there is still time for a decision of the Veterans Administration . . .

has been no allegation of intent, but I would like to repeat what I said before that in order to find Mr. Kutcher guilty you have got to produce guilt instead of presuming guilt because you didn't produce one witness in this room or one fact against Mr. Kutcher.

The only evidence produced this afternoon has been produced by Mr. Kutcher out of his own mouth and under oath . . .

Mr. Kutcher told you under oath that he had never done these things. You have produced not one iota or witness, not one informer has stood before us to be subjected to cross-examination. You had some secret informer say that he defied the American flag. You heard Mr. Kutcher say he had not defied the American flag. I say you have no choice. You either produce that man who said that about the American flag and let him say it in our face or you must take Mr. Kutcher's testimony at its face value and I say you haven't any evidence in this case against Mr. Kutcher of any form.

There is nothing here but favorable testimony. Mr. Kutcher has said nothing that isn't honorable. I don't happen to believe in socialism, but it is perfectly honorable for Mr. Kutcher to stand here and say he believes in it . . .

I say that the only people who would really suffer if you should deny this pension to Mr. Kutcher are the American people because they will be ashamed of having a Veterans Administration that would take away from this man on this record the thing which Congress gave him.

I know it is late in the year, it is December 30, but I would urge that you give us a decision before the new year. I would urge you don't leave this thing on your conscience and on the American people's conscience for this weekend. It seems to me that there is still time — it is only three o'clock — there is still time for a decision of the Veterans Administration . . .

has been no allegation of intent, but I would like to repeat what I said before that in order to find Mr. Kutcher guilty you have got to produce guilt instead of presuming guilt because you didn't produce one witness in this room or one fact against Mr. Kutcher.

The only evidence produced this afternoon has been produced by Mr. Kutcher out of his own mouth and under oath . . .

Mr. Kutcher told you under oath that he had never done these things. You have produced not one iota or witness, not one informer has stood before us to be subjected to cross-examination. You had some secret informer say that he defied the American flag. You heard Mr. Kutcher say he had not defied the American flag. I say you have no choice. You either produce that man who said that about the American flag and let him say it in our face or you must take Mr. Kutcher's testimony at its face value and I say you haven't any evidence in this case against Mr. Kutcher of any form.

There is nothing here but favorable testimony. Mr. Kutcher has said nothing that isn't honorable. I don't happen to believe in socialism, but it is perfectly honorable for Mr. Kutcher to stand here and say he believes in it . . .

I say that the only people who would really suffer if you should deny this pension to Mr. Kutcher are the American people because they will be ashamed of having a Veterans Administration that would take away from this man on this record the thing which Congress gave him.

I know it is late in the year, it is December 30, but I would urge that you give us a decision before the new year. I would urge you don't leave this thing on your conscience and on the American people's conscience for this weekend. It seems to me that there is still time — it is only three o'clock — there is still time for a decision of the Veterans Administration . . .

has been no allegation of intent, but I would like to repeat what I said before that in order to find Mr. Kutcher guilty you have got to produce guilt instead of presuming guilt because you didn't produce one witness in this room or one fact against Mr. Kutcher.

Upholding Fair Play



Harold Russell (right), armless veteran and star of motion picture "The Best Years of Our Lives," who for a time headed the Kutcher Civil Rights Committee, conferring with Chicago CIO official Willoughby Abner when both worked on discrimination case a year prior to Kutcher fight.

has been no allegation of intent, but I would like to repeat what I said before that in order to find Mr. Kutcher guilty you have got to produce guilt instead of presuming guilt because you didn't produce one witness in this room or one fact against Mr. Kutcher.

The only evidence produced this afternoon has been produced by Mr. Kutcher out of his own mouth and under oath . . .

Mr. Kutcher told you under oath that he had never done these things. You have produced not one iota or witness, not one informer has stood before us to be subjected to cross-examination. You had some secret informer say that he defied the American flag. You heard Mr. Kutcher say he had not defied the American flag. I say you have no choice. You either produce that man who said that about the American flag and let him say it in our face or you must take Mr. Kutcher's testimony at its face value and I say you haven't any evidence in this case against Mr. Kutcher of any form.

There is nothing here but favorable testimony. Mr. Kutcher has said nothing that isn't honorable. I don't happen to believe in socialism, but it is perfectly honorable for Mr. Kutcher to stand here and say he believes in it . . .

I say that the only people who would really suffer if you should deny this pension to Mr. Kutcher are the American people because they will be ashamed of having a Veterans Administration that would take away from this man on this record the thing which Congress gave him.

I know it is late in the year, it is December 30, but I would urge that you give us a decision before the new year. I would urge you don't leave this thing on your conscience and on the American people's conscience for this weekend. It seems to me that there is still time — it is only three o'clock — there is still time for a decision of the Veterans Administration . . .

has been no allegation of intent, but I would like to repeat what I said before that in order to find Mr. Kutcher guilty you have got to produce guilt instead of presuming guilt because you didn't produce one witness in this room or one fact against Mr. Kutcher.

The only evidence produced this afternoon has been produced by Mr. Kutcher out of his own mouth and under oath . . .

Mr. Kutcher told you under oath that he had never done these things. You have produced not one iota or witness, not one informer has stood before us to be subjected to cross-examination. You had some secret informer say that he defied the American flag. You heard Mr. Kutcher say he had not defied the American flag. I say you have no choice. You either produce that man who said that about the American flag and let him say it in our face or you must take Mr. Kutcher's testimony at its face value and I say you haven't any evidence in this case against Mr. Kutcher of any form.

There is nothing here but favorable testimony. Mr. Kutcher has said nothing that isn't honorable. I don't happen to believe in socialism, but it is perfectly honorable for Mr. Kutcher to stand here and say he believes in it . . .

I say that the only people who would really suffer if you should deny this pension to Mr. Kutcher are the American people because they will be ashamed of having a Veterans Administration that would take away from this man on this record the thing which Congress gave him.

I know it is late in the year, it is December 30, but I would urge that you give us a decision before the new year. I would urge you don't leave this thing on your conscience and on the American people's conscience for this weekend. It seems to me that there is still time — it is only three o'clock — there is still time for a decision of the Veterans Administration . . .

has been no allegation of intent, but I would like to repeat what I said before that in order to find Mr. Kutcher guilty you have got to produce guilt instead of presuming guilt because you didn't produce one witness in this room or one fact against Mr. Kutcher.

The only evidence produced this afternoon has been produced by Mr. Kutcher out of his own mouth and under oath . . .

Mr. Kutcher told you under oath that he had never done these things. You have produced not one iota or witness, not one informer has stood before us to be subjected to cross-examination. You had some secret informer say that he defied the American flag. You heard Mr. Kutcher say he had not defied the American flag. I say you have no choice. You either produce that man who said that about the American flag and let him say it in our face or you must take Mr. Kutcher's testimony at its face value and I say you haven't any evidence in this case against Mr. Kutcher of any form.

There is nothing here but favorable testimony. Mr. Kutcher has said nothing that isn't honorable. I don't happen to believe in socialism, but it is perfectly honorable for Mr. Kutcher to stand here and say he believes in it . . .

I say that the only people who would really suffer if you should deny this pension to Mr. Kutcher are the American people because they will be ashamed of having a Veterans Administration that would take away from this man on this record the thing which Congress gave him.

I know it is late in the year, it is December 30, but I would urge that you give us a decision before the new year. I would urge you don't leave this thing on your conscience and on the American people's conscience for this weekend. It seems to me that there is still time — it is only three o'clock — there is still time for a decision of the Veterans Administration . . .

has been no allegation of intent, but I would like to repeat what I said before that in order to find Mr. Kutcher guilty you have got to produce guilt instead of presuming guilt because you didn't produce one witness in this room or one fact against Mr. Kutcher.

The only evidence produced this afternoon has been produced by Mr. Kutcher out of his own mouth and under oath . . .

Mr. Kutcher told you under oath that he had never done these things. You have produced not one iota or witness, not one informer has stood before us to be subjected to cross-examination. You had some secret informer say that he defied the American flag. You heard Mr. Kutcher say he had not defied the American flag. I say you have no choice. You either produce that man who said that about the American flag and let him say it in our face or you must take Mr. Kutcher's testimony at its face value and I say you haven't any evidence in this case against Mr. Kutcher of any form.

There is nothing here but favorable testimony. Mr. Kutcher has said nothing that isn't honorable. I don't happen to believe in socialism, but it is perfectly honorable for Mr. Kutcher to stand here and say he believes in it . . .

I say that the only people who would really suffer if you should deny this pension to Mr. Kutcher are the American people because they will be ashamed of having a Veterans Administration that would take away from this man on this record the thing which Congress gave him.

I know it is late in the year, it is December 30, but I would urge that you give us a decision before the new year. I would urge you don't leave this thing on your conscience and on the American people's conscience for this weekend. It seems to me that there is still time — it is only three o'clock — there is still time for a decision of the Veterans Administration . . .

has been no allegation of intent, but I would like to repeat what I said before that in order to find Mr. Kutcher guilty you have got to produce guilt instead of presuming guilt because you didn't produce one witness in this room or one fact against Mr. Kutcher.

The only evidence produced this afternoon has been produced by Mr. Kutcher out of his own mouth and under oath . . .

Mr. Kutcher told you under oath that he had never done these things. You have produced not one iota or witness, not one informer has stood before us to be subjected to cross-examination. You had some secret informer say that he defied the American flag. You heard Mr. Kutcher say he had not defied the American flag. I say you have no choice. You either produce that man who said that about the American flag and let him say it in our face or you must take Mr. Kutcher's testimony at its face value and I say you haven't any evidence in this case against Mr. Kutcher of any form.

There is nothing here but favorable testimony. Mr. Kutcher has said nothing that isn't honorable. I don't happen to believe in socialism, but it is perfectly honorable for Mr. Kutcher to stand here and say he believes in it . . .

I say that the only people who would really suffer if you should deny this pension to Mr. Kutcher are the American people because they will be ashamed of having a Veterans Administration that would take away from this man on this record the thing which Congress gave him.

I know it is late in the year, it is December 30, but I would urge that you give us a decision before the new year. I would urge you don't leave this thing on your conscience and on the American people's conscience for this weekend. It seems to me that there is still time — it is only three o'clock — there is still time for a decision of the Veterans Administration . . .

has been no allegation of intent, but I would like to repeat what I said before that in order to find Mr. Kutcher guilty you have got to produce guilt instead of presuming guilt because you didn't produce one witness in this room or one fact against Mr. Kutcher.

The only evidence produced this afternoon has been produced by Mr. Kutcher out of his own mouth and under oath . . .

Mr. Kutcher told you under oath that he had never done these things. You have produced not one iota or witness, not one informer has stood before us to be subjected to cross-examination. You had some secret informer

Subscription \$5 per year:
\$1.50 for 6 months. Foreign:
\$4.50 per year; \$2.50 for 6
months. Canadian: \$3.50 per
year; \$1.75 for 6 months.
Single Copies: 5 or more
copies each in U.S. To
each in foreign countries.

THE MILITANT

Published Weekly in the interests of the Working People
THE MILITANT PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION
116 University Pl., N. Y. 3, N. Y. Phone: AL 5-7400
Editor: MURRY WEISS
Business Manager: ANNE CHESTER

Signed articles by contribu-
tors do not necessarily rep-
resent The Militant's policy.
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. XX — No. 5

Monday, January 30, 1956

Lenin and Stalin

Vladimir Ilyich Lenin died 32 years ago on January 21, 1924, just as he was preparing to launch, in collaboration with Trotsky, an all-out fight against the rise of the bureaucratic faction of Stalinism. In his Last Testament, written one year before he died, Lenin appealed to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to find a way to remove Stalin as general secretary. He declared Stalin was "rude and disloyal." And as his last act, Lenin broke off all personal relations with Stalin — a clear sign that he believed that only an implacable political struggle could save the party from bureaucratic degeneration.

The capitalist propagandists deliberately ignore these documented facts about Lenin's attitude toward Stalinism in its embryonic stage of development. They prefer, for reasons of their own, to accept the crude Stalinist falsification of history which depicts Lenin as a sort of precursor of Stalin. Thus the imperialist propagandists hope to discredit the Russian Revolution and its leadership by identifying the crimes of the Stalinist bureaucracy with the name of the great revolutionist Lenin.

It is impossible to identify Lenin's name and tradition with bureaucracy or police dictatorship. For Lenin's whole lifetime was devoted to fighting for the liberation of the creative revolutionary capacities of the working class from the death grip of

the reactionary bureaucracies of the ruling class or the workers' movement.

The Russian Revolution itself, led by Lenin and Trotsky, was the antithesis of bureaucratic methods. It was a tremendous outpouring of the masses of oppressed workers and peasants; it brought into active political life, on a daily and hourly basis, tens of millions of people, who built the beginnings of a new social order by their own activity.

Lenin was a great revolutionary leader because he relied on these revolutionary political capacities of the masses. His every thought was concentrated on how to awaken this capacity and keep it awakened.

The bureaucrats, both Stalinist and Social Democratic, including the labor bureaucrats in the U.S., follow an entirely different method. In contrast to Lenin they rely, not on the democratic activity of the working people, but on the machine of the privileged and powerful labor functionaries. And as against Lenin they rely, not on the class struggle as a means of liberation of the working class, but on class collaborationist maneuvers.

The truth about Lenin will be restored not only because historic justice demands it, but because the movement of the world working class will turn to his revolutionary teachings as an indispensable step toward winning the great battle for socialism.

Soviet "Imperialism"?

In the last year, apologists for U.S., English, Dutch and French imperialism have thrown a new propaganda curve at hundreds of millions of Asian and African people struggling for national independence.

Look here, says an editorial in the Dec. 8 N. Y. Times, since the end of World War II the Western powers have "given freedom" to 600,000,000 people in Asia and Africa. "During this period the Soviets have enslaved more than 600,000,000 people in Europe and Asia."

But, despite recital of these statistics, the Asian and African masses remain unconvinced — as the Times itself is forced to admit. They continue to think that the ruling class of imperialists in the Western capitalist countries is their main enemy and that the Soviet bloc is their ally.

Why do the Asian and African masses reject propaganda about "dying Western colonialism" and "expanding Soviet imperialism"? It is because the statistics on which it is based are devoid of any real content. They deal only with superficial political events and hide the all-important economic content of the struggle against imperialism.

The aim of the national liberation movement in the colonies is to end centuries of economic backwardness and transform these subjugated lands into modern industrial nations. The masses of workers, peasants and students in Asia and Africa are at war with Western bankers and industrialists — and their political agents — who have perpetuated semi-feudal economic relations as part of the pattern of imperialist rule.

Since World War II, political independence of the colonies has been won, not given to one degree or another. But imperialism has maintained its economic

subjugation over them including its alliance with feudal rulers and its curbs on native industrial development.

Thus only the complete overthrow of capitalist and semi-feudal economic relations in Asia and Africa can achieve liberation in the colonies.

China, in a revolution that tore the country out of the clutches of imperialism, has eliminated feudal relations on the land, unified the country and organized a planned economy. China is now in a position to take big strides forward towards industrialization. On the other hand, India will continue to stagnate so long as it remains in the toils of imperialism. It will continue to be divided, burdened with feudal exploitation and dependent on foreign capital.

As for Eastern Europe, most of these countries languished under monarchies and dictators prior to World War II. Their economic development was choked by domination of the big imperialist powers. With the transformation of the property forms attendant on their incorporation within the Soviet structure, the Eastern European countries have shown vigorous economic growth. The rate outstrips by far that of Asian and African countries and is also greater than that of West European capitalist countries.

It is true that the working people in Eastern Europe — just as those in the Soviet Union itself — suffer from the political tyranny of the Kremlin oligarchs. But it is precisely the great economic advances registered throughout the Soviet bloc on the basis of nationalized industry and planned production that gives the workers confidence in its struggle against the dictatorship. Their aim is to clear away the bureaucracy from the road towards building socialism.

The FBI Attacks Dr. Howard

A measure of the degree to which the police-state psychology has made inroads in this country is the almost universal treatment of the FBI by politicians and newspapers as a sacred cow. Now a man who has proven his courage in other fields has said some unvarnished, uncompromising things about this sacred cow. He is Dr. Theodore R. M. Howard, Negro leader from Mississippi. In response the sacred cow's top hand, J. Edgar Hoover, has blasted Howard in an unprecedented, arrogant, open letter.

Howard's crime consists of criticizing the FBI's role or lack of role in investigating the racist reign of terror. On a number of occasions he has called attention to the fact that the FBI doesn't seem to be able to solve a case where the victim is a Negro and the killers white supremacists.

Howard isn't the only Negro leader to comment on this. For example, last October Rep. A. Clayton Powell told a labor-sponsored rally in New York that in his opinion this failure of the FBI was due to the fact that the FBI in the Deep South states was staffed by native white Southerners. He said he was going to ask Hoover to make special assignments of Northern agents to the investigation of the Mississippi murders of Rev. Lee, Lamar Smith and Emmett Till.

The perfunctory FBI inquiry into the attempted lynching of Gus Courts several months later indicated that the situation hadn't changed. Indeed this is the FBI's

old, established pattern in the South. What ever came of the FBI investigations of the bomb-lynching of NAACP leaders Harry and Harriet Moore? Of the cold-blooded murder of Samuel Shepherd, and near-murder of Walter Lee Irvin by racist Sheriff Willis McCall?

Hoover's arguments that the FBI isn't a policy-making body and can only go where it's told, that it had no jurisdiction to investigate the Till kidnaping and lynching simply won't wash. The FBI sticks its nose in wherever it pleases. It apparently has jurisdiction to jump into kidnaping cases in the North immediately. Afterwards the question of crossing state lines is looked into. Its agents apparently had jurisdiction to keep an eye on the Till protest meetings. FBI agents have enough jurisdiction apparently to go around asking the neighbors of politically-suspect whites whether those under investigation ever entertain Negroes socially in their homes.

Dr. Howard has probably done more investigation of the lynchings in Mississippi than the whole FBI combined. He played a major part in tracing and producing the prosecution witnesses in the Till case. We say to him: You are absolutely right in not being intimidated by Hoover, speak the truth as you see it about the FBI and all the other forces in American society responsible by commission or omission for the unpunished racist killings in the South.

By Morris Stein

The disclosure that the U. S. has been brought to the brink of nuclear war much too often for comfort has aroused fear and indignation the world over. An article in Life magazine, Jan. 16, intended mainly to glorify Secretary of State Dulles has revealed instead the frightening picture of a man playing God. On three occasions in as many years Dulles has committed the great military power of the United States, its human resources and wealth, to war, without even bothering to inform the American people about it.

Prior to the publication of the Dulles interview, administration spokesmen demanded that foreign policy be kept out of the election campaign as a patriotic duty. But the interview has unwittingly placed foreign policy at the center of the campaign. This is where it properly belongs.

ISSUE CONCERNS EVERYONE

The man who will be elected president next November will by that token become the head not of the U. S. alone, but of some 42 capitalist countries tied to the U. S. with "security" pacts. Foreign policy, furthermore, affects directly the most important facets of domestic policy.

American commitments all over the world demand a huge permanent military establishment which imposes great burdens on the American people. The country's youth is called upon to give up its best years to man the far-flung military bases. The country's toilers must foot the bill.

The furor created by Dulles' interview testifies to the fact that the American people want a discussion of foreign policy, and that above all they want peace.

Democratic politicians, presidential aspirants in particular, have been quick to realize that Dulles' boastful admission that the Eisenhower administration has been on the brink of three wars in the three years it has been in office offered them a golden opportunity.

In the 1952 elections, the Republicans capitalized on the popular opposition to the costly, stalemate Korean War. They dubbed it Truman's War. The Democratic Party was portrayed as the war party. Now at last Dulles has given them the chance to shed that stigma and try to pin it instead on the Republicans.

The Democrats conveniently forget that Dulles' brink-of-war diplomacy had bipartisan backing, just as the Republicans forgot in 1952 that the Korean War was a bipartisan war.

The kind of "discussion" the two boss parties engage in will contribute little to the enlightenment of the real aims and objectives of U. S. foreign policy which has had in the main the support of both of them.

CHINA — THE "ENEMY"

An understanding of Dulles' "brink of war" foreign policy as well as of the Korean War can be arrived at when we get an answer to the question why revolutionary China has been the "enemy" country in all these instances. This requires an understanding of the Chinese Revolution.

American propaganda has been treating the Chinese Revolution as if it had been some sort of a conspiracy against the U. S. The British Tories must have had the same opinion of the 1776 American Revolution.

Revolutions which result in genuine social change such as the Chinese and the American revolutions cannot be brought about by conspiracy. They result from social explosions involving entire populations. They break out when social conflict can no longer be compromised or repressed, that is, when the masses refuse to be manipulated by their exploiters and take to the political arena in their own interests.

The toiling masses, who in ordinary times are occupied mainly with the daily routine of existence and bear patiently all sorts of humiliation and abuse, take to the road of revolution when life becomes unbearable under the old order.

This is what happened in the



DULLES

American Revolution. This is what happened in the Chinese Revolution. There is much in common between the Chinese and American revolutions. The difference is mainly in the historical epochs separating them.

The American Revolution occurred in the epoch of transition from feudalism to capitalism. The Chinese Revolution took place in the epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism. It is this difference in the epochs which accounts for the difference in the social content of these revolutions. While the American and French revolutions were bourgeois in nature, the Chinese Revolution is proletarian.

The difference is one of nearly two centuries during which capitalism as a social system reached its apex and arrived at a stage when it can no longer advance humanity along a progressive road but on the contrary, drags it down, inflicts upon it endless wars, economic crises, fascism, and general decay.

Capitalism today is too senile to be able to woo the fresh, awakening masses of Asia and Africa. For many decades capitalist colonialism held these people down in misery and backwardness. China was one of

these countries subjected to imperialist exploitation.

THE CONQUEST OF CHINA

This great country, populated by a quarter of humankind, represented up to a century ago an ancient, stagnant civilization. This is how the imperialists found it in the middle of the last century when they began the invasion of China. They found China easy prey. Each imperialist power proceeded to carve out a section for its exclusive exploitation.

Great Britain cut off Burma, Malaya; built Singapore and Hong Kong as its own bastions for control of the sea way to China and its commerce. The French sliced off Indo-China. Japan took Korea and South Manchuria as its exclusive preserve. Later it went on to conquer North Manchuria.

Only the intense rivalry between the imperialist powers prevented China's complete dismemberment. The U. S. having arrived later on the scene than the Old World powers, and being further removed than Japan, operated under the slogan of "the open door" in China. It needed an open door to elbow its way in.

By virtue of this imperialist penetration China was drawn into world economy, and a corresponding change of social relations took place within the country.

The backwardness of Chinese economy was determined by the stagnation of its productive forces over a lengthy historical period. The whole structure of Chinese society had rested solidly on the mass of the peasants who paid rent to the landlords, profits to the merchants, interest to the money lenders and taxes in labor, in kind and in money to the state.

When the burden would become unbearable to the peasant mass, it would rise up in rebellion and overthrow the exploiting dynasty. The peasant revolutions of the past sooner or later spent themselves and a new dynasty would arise in place of the old. Then the same process of peasant exploitation would start over again.

Once the outside imperialist powers established their hegemony, the traditional peasant revolutions could no longer bring about even limited changes. The last such peasant uprising was the Taiping Rebellion of the mid-nineteenth century. The

Christian character of this movement aroused a certain sympathy among the missionaries, but what determined its outcome was the fact that this movement opposed the trade in opium. The Christian imperialists wouldn't forego the lush profits from the opium trade which they had imposed on China. They threw their full weight behind the Manchu dynasty and crushed the rebellion.

IMPERIALIST RULE

As a result the imperialists acquired even tighter control over the Manchus and over the country. This brought to an end a protracted historical era in which the Chinese peasantry could hope to resolve its problems by methods typical of peasant rebellion. The peasants were no longer faced just with their own landlords, money lenders and emperors. Real power was lodged in the hands of foreign imperialists, and world imperialism became the dominant force in the country. The native rulers could rule only by the grace of the imperialists and then only as junior partners.

China could not extricate itself from its backwardness, gain nationhood, do away with the feudal relations on the land, and advance economically except in direct collision with the imperialist overlords.

The question of war today hinges mainly on China. Thus it is essential for the American people to understand the Chinese Revolution. The American people have every reason to look with sympathy upon the heroic effort of the Chinese people to lift themselves out of centuries of backwardness and misery. The Chinese have a right to free themselves from imperialist plunder and build their own economy as they see fit. Once that is understood, it will be clear who the warmongers are.

Stalinists Distort Lenin In Debate with Guardian

By Harry Ring

For some time the Communist Party has been engaged in a curious controversy with the National Guardian, organ of the Progressive Party. The Guardian editors have put forward the position that it is necessary to build some kind of a third party movement in opposition to the two capitalist parties. The Stalinists, who represent themselves as "Marxist-Leninist," have consistently attacked the views of the Guardian from the right.

The Guardian stand is a confused and vacillating one. Its proposed program for a third party attempts to simultaneously embrace Marx and Roosevelt. It does not know whether it is aiming for a new socialist party or a mass labor party based on organized labor. But the Stalinist attack on the Guardian is not aimed at correcting what is unclear or incorrect but rather to strike down the correct idea that it is necessary to fight both the Democratic and Republican parties. In the name of Lenin and a struggle against "ultra-leftism," the Stalinists demand adherence to their policy of supporting the Democratic party.

QUOTE OUT OF CONTEXT

Arguing for the need to get into the Democratic party because that party has the support of the majority of workers, Max Gordon, in the Nov. 22 Daily Worker, admonished the Guardian that Lenin had insisted that, in developing tactics, "you must soberly observe the actual state of class consciousness of the whole (working) class . . . of all the toiling masses, not only of the advanced elements." ("Left-Wing Communism — An Infantile Disorder")

Since this month marks the 32nd anniversary of the death of Lenin it is a particularly appropriate time to set the record straight on the teachings of that giant Marxist leader and the manner in which the Stalinists attempt to turn those teachings into their opposite.

Gordon adds a covering footnote to this quotation from Lenin: "Though written in a different time and context, this tactical lesson is highly relevant to the current discussion."

Since Gordon is concerned with "context," it might be well to round out his quotation from Lenin by adding the sentences that immediately precede it. Lenin said: "You must not sink to the level of the masses, to the

"What is now happening to Marx's doctrine has, in the course of history, often happened to the doctrines of other revolutionary thinkers and leaders of oppressed classes struggling for emancipation. During the lifetime of great revolutionaries, the opposing classes have visited relentless persecution on them and received their teaching with the most savage hostility, the most furious hatred, the most ruthless campaign of lies and slanders. After their death, attempts are made to turn them into harmless icons, canonize them, and surround their names with a certain halo for the 'consolation' of the oppressed classes and with the object of duping them, while at the same time emasculating and vulgarizing the real essence of their revolutionary theories and blunting their revolutionary edge." — Lenin, State and Revolution.

level of the backward strata of the class. This is incontestable. You must tell them the bitter truth. You must call their bourgeois-democratic and parliamentary prejudices — prejudices. After laying down this principle Lenin went on, "But at the same time you must soberly observe . . . etc."

Compare Lenin's stand with that of the Stalinist Gordon who flays the Guardian because "it makes the Democrats, especially the more liberal ones, the main butt of its attack. Yet these are the politicians whom the mass of workers and others view as the main obstacle to reactionary rule."

Don't attack the "liberal" capitalist politicians because the workers have illusions about them! It was precisely this kind of opportunist politics that Lenin fought against throughout his entire life. It was his victory over the proponents of this kind of politics within the workers movement that brought about the Russian Revolution of 1917 and the creation of the Soviet Republic.

Lenin was a consummate politician, a master of flexible tactics and strategy. But his flexible tactics were always related to and flowed directly from basic class struggle principles. The principle on which Lenin built the Bolshevik party was that of the complete independence of the working class from the capitalists and their political represen-

tatives. His merciless war against the Russian Mensheviks, against Kautsky and the other socialist renegades on an international plane was motivated wholly by the efforts of these opportunist tendencies to put the workers movement into the position of a tail end of the "liberal" capitalist politicians.

In Russia, where the workers were an actual minority of the population, the reformists could advance more plausible sounding arguments for their thesis that the workers must support the "lesser evil," that is the capitalist class as against Czarism. And for a period of time they had the support of the workers. Yet Lenin held firm to his thesis that only the workers could successfully lead the struggle to wipe out the Czarist regime and to his minority party he insisted, "We must patiently explain."

AND THE U.S.?

If in backward Russia Lenin taught the workers never to rely on the capitalist liberals, even to accomplish a capitalist revolution against Czarism, what would he say about the situation in the U.S. today? Here the working class is in the majority. The capitalists are in power. They are the center of world counter-revolution. Through their two parties, plus the labor bureaucrats, they are preparing to drag us into a war to save world capitalism. What other course is open for class-conscious workers than a principled struggle against capitalism and its parties in preparation for the mass formation of an independent labor party?

The Stalinists have as much right as Meany and Reuther to pursue a course that is the polar opposite of Lenin's. But they do not have the right to represent their course as his. The man who waged war against the renegade Kautsky for trying to convert Marx into a "common liberal" would not relish the use of his name in defense of a policy of supporting capitalist politicians. His stand was crystal clear. He declared:

"There is one, and only one, kind of real internationalism: hard work at developing the revolutionary movement and the revolutionary struggle in one's own land, and support (by propaganda, sympathy, material aid) of such, and only such, struggles and policies in every country without exception."

"Everything else," he said, "is deception."

World Events

NEGOTIATIONS between the Chinese and U.S. governments, begun last Summer in Geneva, are stalemated. Last week the Chinese government denounced U.S. State Department demands for a declaration that the Mao regime renounce "the use of force" in pressing its claims on Formosa and other islands off the Chinese mainland. By population and history the islands are part of China. Chiang's dictatorial control over them is maintained solely by means of U.S. aid — including the presence of the Seventh Fleet. The Chinese government has offered to settle all international disputes with the U.S. "without resorting to threats of force," but insists that Formosa and the other islands are an internal affair of China. The Chinese denounce the December, 1954, treaty between the U.S. government and Chiang whereby Washington would maintain military forces in the Formosa area. They denounce, too, the "predated declaration of war" passed by Congress last January, threatening the Chinese should they attempt to unite Formosa and the other islands with the rest of China. Meanwhile military conflict in the straits is increasing again with Chiang's U.S.-financed air force carrying on systematic raids on the mainland, and the Chinese government "stepping up bombardment of Quemoy."

THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT will go ahead with plans to test an H-bomb, Prime Minister Eden announced on Jan. 21.

"A MOOD OF GLOOM and discouragement is settling over official London," Don Cook reports in the Jan. 22 N.Y. Herald Tribune in connection with Prime Minister Eden and Foreign Secretary Selwyn Lloyd's forthcoming trip to a top-level Anglo-American conference in Washington. "This mood grows from the enormity of the difficulties and the intensifications of dangers in the Middle East with which the two governments are trying to cope. . . . Britain has watched one 'instrument of power' after another slip from her hands in the Middle East in the last ten years." The principal force endangering U.S. and British imperialism's huge oil stake in the Middle East is the rise of the national independence movement among the Arab peoples.

ALGERIANS KILLED BY FRENCH "security forces in the North African nation during the

week ending Jan. 22 number 580, according to the Jan. 23 N.Y. Times. The French claim to have killed 61 Algerians in a 48-hour period. French imperialist forces are seeking to crush the Algerian revolution for national independence, but the revolt continues to spread.

EIGHTEEN FRENCH ARMY RESERVISTS who participated in the "railway rebellion" last October against being sent to North Africa were placed under formal military charges of revolt Jan. 23 in Paris.

OIL AND AIRLINE NATIONALIZATION is the issue over which the two sections of Austria's coalition cabinet are deadlocked. The Socialist Party which controls the Minister for Transportation and State Enterprises refuses to grant licenses to a private airline which is backed by the People's Party. The People's Party which controls the Chancellorship refuses to allow the state-owned oil company to drill in areas which it has leased to a private company. It is believed new elections are inevitable within the next few months.

AUSTRALIA'S DOCKERS are engaged in a nation-wide strike for pay increases. The strike which involves about 10,000 workers has tied up the nation's shipping during the height of the export season and created a national crisis.

INDONESIA'S PRO-U.S. State Dept. Cabinet is on the verge of collapse as the result of the resignation of the Moslem Union and Moslem Teacher's parties on Jan. 19. A newly formed Cabinet may have Communist Party members.

Pioneer Pocket Library

1. The Death Agony of Capitalism and the Tasks of the Fourth International

This basic document was drafted by Leon Trotsky and adopted by the Founding Conference of the Fourth International, 64 pages, 25c.

2. The Suppressed Testament of Lenin, by Leon Trotsky. This document reprints Lenin's last advice to his party and explains why Stalin suppressed it. 48 pages, 25c.

Order from
PIONEER PUBLISHERS
116 University Place, 3, N. Y.

The Negro Struggle

By Jean Blake

Youth Want Jobs (II)

The "Don't Buy Where You Can't Work" campaigns are an important part of the history of the struggle for job opportunities in almost every sizable, Negro community of the North and West.

Most of these campaigns arose as isolated, localized drives, led by newly formed committees or organizations. They generally had the support of the local Negro press, but only sometimes the approval of the NAACP chapter in the city.

In the period that the "Don't Buy Where You Can't Work" campaigns were at their height, 1935 to 1950, the conditions in the different communities where they appeared were similar, and so were the tactics and methods that followed.

Following the mass unemployment of the depths of the Depression, some wheels were beginning to turn. Some job opportunities were beginning to open up—but not for Negroes. In the overcrowded, segregated, colored communities even the retail businesses which did all in their power to entice Negroes into the stores to buy, refused to let them in to work, as employees.

The old leaders of the colored communities—ministers, lawyers, NAACP and fraternal order heads—did nothing to change the situation. So new leaders emerged. Younger men and women came forth with proposals for fighting tactics and methods of struggle that could utilize the only strength the masses had—numbers.

Around that simple slogan, "Don't Buy Where You Can't Work," they organized picket lines to protest the discriminatory

employment practices of one business place after another, and to enforce a boycott against the offending merchants to compel them to hire Negroes.

Like the young CIO unions of the same period, the early job-opportunity campaigns were hardened by the physical, legal and psychological attacks of their enemies. Leaders were sometimes imprisoned or beaten by local police. Uncle Toms and stooges for the employers were used to try to break the solidarity of the Negro workers or discredit militant leaders by slander or frame-up.

A vivid account of these struggles as experienced by the classic movement of this type, the Future Outlook League of Cleveland, Ohio, is provided in "The Future Is Yours," by Charles H. Loeb.

The book, published in 1947, is recommended reading not only for its factual history of the impressive victories won by the FOL from 1935 to 1946, but, as the preface states, for "the analysis of a philosophy, and a discussion of the modus operandi for obtaining economic equality."

Loeb wrote, "Because those who brought the League into being were youthful, both in years and in thinking, they were able to approach the problem with minds that had not become fixed to think of life in terms of their habitual surroundings. They were able to approach the challenge with boldness and zest, with determination and courage. They refused to accept the injustices, the prejudices, and the inequities around them as a pattern that had to remain fixed."

Next week's column will deal with the use of these tactics today.

Youth Cool to Army Future

By Henry Gitano

Only eight per cent of American youth believes that it would probably like military service. The overwhelming majority regards military life as an onerous obligation, as "something to do if he must and get it over." These were the conclusions of a special survey for the Defense Department conducted by Public Opinion Surveys under Dr. George Gallup.

The survey, released Dec. 31, 1955, states that civilians do not attribute much prestige to a military career. A majority of the youth questioned believed it would see this country in another war during its lifetime. Most potential draftees said they would wait to be drafted, indicating a marked indifference to the six-month reserve training program.

The Pentagon ordered the survey to help it "establish a baseline from which a program could be launched to enhance the prestige of a military career in order to attract and retain high quality personnel."

"Morale legislation" bait to increase the attractiveness of regimentation has been requested by the President and the Defense Department for the past two years. Hanson W. Baldwin, N. Y. Times military analyst, in his Jan. 8 column discussing "attract and hold" legislation, says: "These requests were prompted by the low state of morale of the services and the large turnover of both officers and enlisted personnel."

In its drive for permanent conscription through the Reserve Force Act of Aug. 2, 1955, the Pentagon has met no response.

Under this would-be "bargain basement" deal, 17 to 18½-year-olds volunteer for six months active service with a 7½-year reserve obligation, thus avoiding a two-year draft with a four-year reserve clause. Ten thousand draft-avoiding volunteers were expected each month beginning Oct. 1, 1955. Reports on the first three months show that only 1,224 have started training; 96% of the anticipated volunteers failed to show up. The goal is 2,900,000 ready reservists by mid-1959.

The military wants army training to become universal. And the brass has definite ideas about what kind of training this should be. In Armed Forces Talk, No. 281, used for troop information, it says that "training in the service is designed to instill in us the direct and almost automatic obedience to orders. . . The habit of discipline must become almost second nature to us and can be acquired only by actual performance."

August B. Hollingshead described the militarizing of the civilian mind in the American Journal of Sociology in March, 1946: "The perfectly trained soldier is one who has had his civilian initiative reduced to zero. . . The recruit must be remade, as any old sergeant knows 'a recruit is not worth a damn until he has been broken.'"

But the youth has expressed through the Gallup Poll the fact that the aims of U.S. imperialism leave it uninspired. Youth does not want to be "broken" by the military as a first step to crushing the forward movement of people in other lands.

Notes from the News

POWER SHOVELS are being steadily increased in size to handle huge quantities of ore in open face strip mines. The latest one, produced by the Marion Power and Shovel Company, Marion, Ohio, can scoop up 90 tons (60 cubic yards) at one bite. It is 160 feet tall. Yet it is already outstripped by a Getman giant machine 214½ feet high. The capacity of the American shovel, 38,400 cubic yards (29,376 cubic meters) per day, is exceeded by the German shovel which scoops 100,000 cubic meters a day.

AN ARMY FIELD BOARD OF INQUIRY delves deeply into the record of men involved in security discharge cases. Civil Liberties in New York, in its Jan.-Feb. issue, publishes the following excerpt of testimony.

"Q. Did you join any organizations during this time subsequent to your separation from active duty?"

A. Yes, Sir.

Q. Will you name these organizations?

A. American Automobile Association.
Q. Any others?
A. No, Sir.
Q. To the best of your knowledge, did the American Automobile Association have any subversive aims?"

A SHOTGUN BLAST on Jan. 16 fired into the house of James M. Hinton, President of the South Carolina National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, fortunately failed to injure anyone. The "unknown assailants" were seen speeding away in an automobile. Asked if he thought the action might be in connection with his activities in behalf of school desegregation Mr. Hinton responded "You can only have your thoughts."

WASTE AND BUSINESS INEFFICIENCY in government departments have been scored by the House subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee. The subcommittee charges that business men such as Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson are not a "panacea" for problems of administration. Among the charges is one that the Navy had a stock pile of canned hamburger that could keep it supplied for 60 years.

U.S. POLITICAL FUGITIVES forced into a High Sierra hideaway by political persecution figured in a decision handed down by the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals in San Francisco, Jan. 20. In upholding the conviction of four persons for "harboring" Communist Party leader Robert G. Thompson, Judge Dal M. Lemon said in the Majority (2 to 1) decision: "We must avoid leaning too far backwards in being 'fair' to Communists lest we fall into an abyss of error and give these enemies of the United States 'aid and comfort.'"

HE'S NOT KIDDING. Writing on the topic of taxation in his memoirs, Harry Truman said, "I never advocated taxing the rich to pay the poor."


THE MILITANT

VOLUME XX

MONDAY, JANUARY 30, 1956

NUMBER 5

Pickets Halt Coal Delivery



Determined Westinghouse strikers at Sharon, Pa., block a coal truck trying to make delivery at strike-bound plant. Militancy of strikers has been heightened by company-inspired police violence which resulted in death of 34-year-old striker Troy Tadlock Jan. 3 at company's Columbus, Ohio, plant.

Bankrupt Politics Seen In Ohio CIO Convention

By Mel Childs

The Ohio State CIO on Jan. 5, 6 and 7 held in Cleveland what may very well be the last CIO convention before the merger with the AFL. It dealt with many problems that confront the workers and it failed to deal with many others.

In Ohio the workers are taxed more heavily than in most other Northern states. This is due to the political domination of the Taft philosophy. There is a state sales tax and many cities have payroll taxes that are deducted from the workers' pay. On the other hand, the corporations of Ohio have many special tax privileges such as laws passed to place valuable property, like blast furnaces, on the personal property listings which pay much lower taxes than real estate.

The CIO convention called for the repeal of the sales tax and for changing the whole tax structure so that the ability to

pay would be the theory behind the taxing policies. How does the CIO propose to change the tax laws? By voting for candidates of the two old parties and then urging these "friends of labor" to live up to their promises.

UNEMPLOYMENT RISE

Unemployment is again on the increase. It is not too great as yet, but there is a rise in the number of those receiving unemployment compensation. Also several of the auto plants are operating on shorter hours. Automation is increasing in Ohio and will be throwing many out of work. The convention went on record to fight once more for increased unemployment and workmen's compensation to care for the needy. But nothing is said about reducing the hours of work per week without cutting weekly take-home pay.

The important Westinghouse strike was on at the time of the Convention. What did the con-

vention do? It voted to give \$5,000 to the strikers and urged support of the strike. But it failed to begin the all-important job of mobilizing the entire labor movement to assist the embattled workers on the picket lines. Union officials fear to stir up the ranks of the labor movement and get them into motion. They fear they cannot control the unions so easily once the workers move into action.

Ohio has the Devine Law on its books—a law similar to the federal Smith Act under which the Socialist Workers Party leaders were railroaded to jail in 1941 and under which the Communist Party leaders are being jailed. But the state CIO kept its mouth shut on the subject of the witch hunt. It was silent because the union bureaucrats believe in the witch hunt as a means of maintaining their control of the unions.

Ohio is also distinguished as one of the few Northern states which has areas that openly and publicly defy the U.S. Supreme Court's desegregation order. The State CIO convention just passed the usual resolutions against discrimination and that was all. Not one word was said about the terror in the South, the need for the labor movement to put on a drive to organize the South on a non-discriminatory basis and thereby help to do away with the racist terror of the South.

POLITICAL BANKRUPTCY

The political action policy remained the same—the bankrupt policy of supporting "friends of labor" within the two old parties is to prevail. And in Ohio we have the phenomenon where Democrats often admit publicly that they support the Republican program. In other states most Democrats at least claim that they are against the Republicans, but not the leading ones in Ohio.

The Democratic governor, Frank J. Lausche, has denounced labor on several occasions in strikes. In the Westinghouse struggle he supported the strike-breaking in Columbus and blamed the union for the violence and "trouble."

So bad has been the open anti-labor position of Gov. Lausche that the CIO has not endorsed anyone for governor for several elections. This demonstrates the complete political bankruptcy of the labor movement with its class collaboration policies.

Last, but by no means least important for the bureaucrats who attended the convention, was the struggle for the top position of President of the State CIO. The struggle in the steel union which found Director James P. Griffin from Youngstown opposing McDonald's choice, Howard Hague, was very much in evidence. The McDonald forces undoubtedly agreed that Griffin had to be disciplined and purged. The necessary deals were made and Griffin announced that he was withdrawing from the race, seeing that he would be defeated anyway.

... NAACP Civil Rights Rally

(Continued from page 1)

ments about the civil rights mobilization were intended to undercut the growing sentiment for a March on Washington and the demand for troops to Mississippi or not, there is no real conflict between them. Indeed, the only chance for any results emerging from the civil rights mobilization will depend on the degree to which the March on Washington and troops - to - Mississippi proposals are adopted.

Previous civil rights mobilizations have centered their demands on revision of Senate Rule 22—the rule which permits the filibustering to death of anti-Jim Crow legislation. This rule can only be changed on the first day of a new Congress—the day when the Senate adopts its rules of procedure for the next two years. On Senate's opening day a year ago, the Northern liberals who were pledged to fight for a change of Rule 22 failed even to introduce a motion to change the vicious rule. This rang the death knell for civil rights legislation in 1955 and 1956.

ABJECT SURRENDER

So abject are the Northern Democrats before the Southern leaders of the House and Senate

that they failed to put up a real fight to get civil rights legislation to the floor for debate. Not a single civil rights bill reached the floor. They all died in committee pigeon holes or in the void between committee and floor. The only way anything having to do with the fight against Jim Crow reached the floor last session was by way of amendments tacked on to other bills as with the Jim Crow army reserve bill and the school aid bill.

This means that the coming civil rights mobilization will be hard put for practical measures to demand of the politicians. The demand can't be for the change now of Senate Rule 22—that will have to wait till the opening day of Congress in 1957. They can't effectively demand that Northern Democrats break the official party line keeping peace with the Dixiecrat wing of the party unless they are ready to break them and there with the Northern liberals who put unity with the white supremacists above the fight for civil rights and justice in Mississippi.

The proposals raised by Negro and labor leaders during the height of the popular anger over the Till case for the unseating of the unspeakable Senator Eastland and the other un-

representative representatives of Mississippi cannot be accomplished by this mobilization either. The fight on their seats will be over before the mobilization takes place. Indeed a serious attempt to unseat them could only be realized if the Negro people and labor put the gun of threatened opposition in the coming elections to any Northern Democrat who refused to fight for the outcasts.

WHAT DEMANDS?

What then will the civil rights rally in Washington demand? If it simply demands that Northern Democrats continue giving lip service to civil rights while they play footsie with the Dixiecrats, little will be accomplished. But if it departs from the whole tenor of previous civil rights mobilizations by demanding the sending of federal troops to Mississippi then it may be able to blast some action out of Congress.

Federal troops in Mississippi could end the lynchings, murders and beatings of Negroes now taking place. Moreover, they could supervise the coming elections and then there would be no question of whether Eastland and his fellow racists would have seats in Congress.

Already A. Philip Randolph, AFL-CIO Vice-President and head

... Class Struggle in India

(Continued from page 1)

struggle lies in the oppression of India by foreign and native capitalist exploiters. Under British rule, India, which is composed of about 14 different major nationalities, was "united" by the armed force of the imperialist occupation. At the same time the British played one national group against the other to facilitate the job of subjugation. Commercial and capitalist class divisions were superimposed on the linguistic divisions.

Bombay, India's largest city with a population of three million, and the nation's most developed industrial center, is a case in point. The working class majority is Maharashtra and the capitalists are largely Gujarati. A States Reorganization Commission set up by the Nehru government has been making recommendations during the past year for changing the map of India along the lines of its national groupings. This commission proposed that Bombay which lies in Maharashtra be made a separate political unit. This would deprive the Maharashtra state of its industrial heart as well as its population center and protect the privileged position of the ruling capitalist minority.

When this proposal was being debated in the Bombay legislature last November, the working masses of the city entered the political stage with peaceful mass demonstrations outside the meeting hall. They were met with tear gas, police clubs, and mass arrests by the "non-violent" pro-Nehru government. A general strike or "hartal" (literally, "expression of sorrow over some sad happening") was threatened by the unions, and the problem was left for some later announcement by Nehru's commission. (It was this announcement that precipitated the recent outbreak.)

Nehru adopted an attitude of studied nonchalance toward the linguistic demands of the working people. The following report appeared in the Dec. 4

Bharat Jyoti, a Bombay capitalist newspaper: "Prime Minister Nehru (in a speech at Kurnool) is also understood to have referred to the violent demonstrations in Bombay and remarked that those who created the trouble had only ruined their case. . . Shri Nehru also made a passing reference to the reorganization of the Punjab and said ultimately it mattered little in what way the state boundaries were re-drawn. These were passing phases, the people should not magnify the importance of linguistic issues."

GENERAL STRIKE ERUPTS

For a man to whom it does not matter which way the boundaries are drawn, Nehru took a curiously rigid stand on his own proposals. The decision that Bombay would be made a separate city under federal administration was announced Jan. 15 and on that day the masses entered the scene once again. This time with a general strike and demonstrations that lasted 10 days, spread throughout India, and made headlines throughout the world.

For a British-educated bourgeois like Nehru who speaks many languages, and whose main demand of the masses is that they passively accept what the bourgeois leaders tell them, linguistic issues are perhaps not to be magnified. But to a Bombay mill hand or a peasant in Bengal sweating his life away for 50 cents a day or less they can be very important.

These working people are beginning to believe there is something better to be done with their lives than to let them drop dead and they want the chance to do something about it. To such a worker the question of whether the administration of his community, the parliamentary debates and the schools shall be conducted in a language he understands or one he doesn't is a life or death political question. Nehru's attitude proved infuriating to the workers of Bombay, and to those

of the other areas to which the demonstrations spread.

BASIC DEMOCRATIC RIGHT

That different nationalities are entitled to their own language and cultural institutions is part of the traditional democratic demands of a people striving to take a hand in their own destiny. For a government which does not fear the masses it is an easy demand to grant. In Russia after the revolution of 1917, the Bolsheviks brought to life the principle of full democratic rights and autonomy for nationalities, and in the process created an over-all national unity stronger than had ever existed before. This was possible because they were not afraid of the unity of the masses, or their common goals, or their common class struggle. On the contrary, the Bolsheviks strove to bring it about.

China was unified by the force of a revolution in which the masses saw clearly their common needs and their common goals. But the capitalist class of India has failed to solve the economic, social or political problems of the country. It stands in the way of the only solution to these problems—the revolutionary unity of the masses. In order to maintain its grip on the country it must keep the workers and peasants of the far-flung land divided.

Nehru has taken a knife from the arsenal of British Imperialism, and has used his States Reorganization Commission to divide and exploit. Like the British "vivisection of India" into Pakistan and India, Nehru's reorganization is intended to keep the language groups fighting among themselves.

In Bombay, Calcutta and other centers, the attempt to disenfranchise the working class by excluding it from its natural political surroundings is meeting with the kind of resistance which only a proletariat on the threshold of revolutionary maturity can generate.

PHILADELPHIA HOUSE PARTY

Duncan Ferguson
Well-Known Sculptor
Will Exhibit
His Latest Piece of Sculpture
And Discuss
Art and Society Today
At the home of
Howard Le Compte
2825 W. Somerset St.
Refreshments — Dancing
Donation: 50c.

SEATTLE

Sunday Afternoon
SOCIALIST SCHOOL
2:00 — 5:00 P. M.

Offering two courses:

I. The A-B-C's of Socialism
II. The Real History of the American Revolution

FEBRUARY 5

Course I, Lecture 2:

HUMAN SOCIETY

AND HUMAN NATURE

Instructor: Clara Kaye

Course II, Lecture 2:

HOW THE COLONISTS

ARRIVED

Instructor: Frank Powers

201 Maynard Bldg.

1st Avenue South and

Washington Street

Seattle Branch, SWP

ATTENTION CHICAGO READERS

Kutcher Protest Meeting

hear:

Kenneth Doufy

III. Dir. of ACLU

and

James Kutcher

Hamilton Hotel

(Madison and Dearborn)

Feb. 10, 8:00 P. M.

Meeting sponsored by leading

Chicago citizens including:

Saul Alinsky, Joseph Brum-

berg, Jim Cunningham, Rev.

Joseph M. Evans, Kermit Eby,

Maynard Krueger, Edward

Marciniak and many others.

Now in Stock

The Geography of Hunger

By Josue de Castro \$1.25*

The Iron Heel

By Jack London \$2.00*

*Please add 15c. for postage

Order from:

Pioneer Publishers

116 University Place

New York 3, N. Y.

Subscribe!

Start your subscription now. Clip the coupon and mail it in today. Send \$1.50 for six months subscription or \$3 for a full year to The Militant, 116 University Place, New York 3, N. Y.

Name

Street Zone

City State

☐ \$1.50 Six months ☐ \$3.00 Full year

☐ New ☐ Renewal